



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## THE PRESENT STATUS OF THE INQUIRY CONCERNING THE GENUINENESS OF THE PAULINE EPISTLES.

By BERNHARD WEISS,  
Berlin.

SINCE the end of the second century thirteen Pauline epistles have been included in the canon of the New Testament. To be sure at that time no one had thought, nor was anyone competent, to examine these letters, which had for a very long time been read and used (even if not expressly cited) by ecclesiastical writers, with a view to determining whether they were what they professed to be, letters of the apostle Paul. There had never so much as a doubt arisen on this point. Only in our century has criticism raised the question whether all these thirteen epistles are to be attributed to Paul. First of all Eichhorn and De Wette denied the genuineness of the pastoral epistles; but doubts were also early entertained concerning the so-called epistle to the Ephesians and the second epistle to the Thessalonians. Yet the only question ever discussed was whether the epistles were to be attributed to Paul himself or to one of his disciples.

Baur was the first to reject all the shorter Pauline epistles, accepting as genuine only the four epistles, to the Romans, Corinthians, and Galatians; the others, he maintained, could not have arisen before the second century. But even in his school there soon sprang up a reaction against his position, Hilgenfeld again ascribing to the apostle the first epistle to the Thessalonians, the epistle to the Philippians, and the epistle to Philemon; and all recent criticism, more or less independent of Baur, agreed with him. But the reactionary movement thus begun reached farther and farther. Holtzmann set to work to prove at least a Pauline basis in the epistle to the Colossians; von Soden reduced the interpolations admitted by him in this letter to a minimum,

until at last he surrendered even this minimum and accepted the whole epistle as genuine. As for the second epistle to the Thessalonians, Paul Schmidt admitted that with the exception of the eschatological passage of the second chapter and a few smaller interpolations there is no ground for supposing it spurious. But when it came to be more and more believed that the meaning of that Pauline "apocalypse" had been found, all considerations against it were dismissed, and critics such as Klöpfer and Jülicher (*Einleitung*, 1894) without further hesitation defended its genuineness. And though Klöpfer at least still maintains the spuriousness of the epistle to the Ephesians, Jülicher declares the objections against it insufficient for its rejection. Recently also Harnack in his *Chronologie der altchristlichen Litteratur* (Vol. I, Leipzig, 1897) has treated all ten Pauline epistles which Marcion had in his canon as genuine. To the pastoral epistles only, as in Eichhorn's time, all recent criticism objects.

There is also, to be sure, a radical wing of recent criticism which even outstrips Baur, declaring as it does the four epistles unassailed by him, and thus the whole body of Pauline epistles, to be spurious. When Bruno Bauer first came forward in the middle of this century with this view it was universally rejected as hypercriticism hardly needing refutation; but recently several Dutch scholars have returned to the same theory. Among German scholars Steck in his *Galaterbrief* (Berlin, 1888) not only tried to prove the spuriousness of this epistle, but also rejected in connection with it the epistles to the Romans and Corinthians. Yet up to the present time he has been opposed, not less than his predecessor, Bruno Bauer, by all schools of criticism. When even a critic like Holtzmann declares this criticism to be the product of a mistaken exegesis and a historico-philosophical *petitio principii*, it is safe to say that there is as yet no occasion for entering into a detailed examination of it. The same holds also respecting the attempt, which has been more and more widely spreading of late, to prove more or less extensive interpolations in the text of the Pauline epistles transmitted to us (*cf.* C. Clemen, *Die Einheitlichkeit der paulinischen Briefe*, Göttingen, 1894). This rests, so far as it is not connected with

critical questions which we shall soon consider, upon exegetical difficulties that exist in the text or the context of the Pauline epistles. But it is clear that if one does not understand how this or that passage fits into the connection, it is far more difficult to conceive how an interpolator could come to interrupt a lucid text with interpolations alleged to be so incongruous. If one discovers, therefore, the line of thought which guided the interpolator, then that may also have been the line of thought of the apostle himself. It will always remain the task of exegesis to understand a document transmitted to us, as it lies before us, and that this is not impossible in the case of the Pauline letters, I believe that I have shown (*cf.* B. Weiss, *Die paulinischen Briefe im berichtigen Text mit kurzer Erläuterung zum Handgebrauch bei der Schriftelektüre*, Leipzig, 1896).

This history of criticism and its present status affords abundant opportunity for a number of fruitful observations. I propose, therefore, to go through the series of the thirteen Pauline epistles according to their almost universally accepted order, and discuss in detail the critical problems which have arisen in the case of each one. In doing thus, I understand by "critical problems" not the grounds of doubt, often very subjective, with which, in the period of the criticism of the Schleiermacher-De Wette school, the genuineness of this or that epistle was disputed, since these, like the interpolation hypotheses named above, are mostly refuted by a careful exegesis. This it is, indeed, which the criticism of Baur and his school achieved for us, viz., that the critical problem is now always formulated in the question whether the epistles under discussion can be understood from the conditions existing in the time of Paul, or point to a later period. By this means only criticism gains a higher, more general interest, inasmuch as whatever its result may be it leads to a deeper historical understanding of these documents which are in any case so highly significant. We shall therefore first of all discuss the questions pertaining to the circumstances of their origin which appear to us not to have been as yet sufficiently cleared up. And in this matter even the extreme radical criticism may become of importance to us in so far as it

shows where even in respect to the Pauline epistles generally held to be genuine historical problems still remain which require a more thorough investigation.

#### I. THE FIRST EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS.

When Baur in his *Paulus* (1845) declared the first epistle to the Thessalonians spurious, the prevailing conception of the epistle furnished a certain justification of this position. Until that time the first three chapters of the epistle had been thought to contain only outpourings of the apostle's heart and retrospects of the time of his ministry in Thessalonica and of his separation from the church; and their purpose remained unintelligible. The short admonitions and eschatological discussions of the fourth and fifth chapters formed, then, in reality the essential part of the epistle, although one could not conceive what was the purpose of those warnings, which aimed only at keeping the disciples from the grossest sins of heathenism, and of these discussions, which involved only the rudiments of the Christian hope for the future. But this conception of the epistle was even on exegetical grounds untenable. For the transition 4:1 with a *λοιπὸν οὖν* shows without doubt that, on the contrary, the first three chapters contain the main subject which the apostle had to discuss with the church, and that from 4:1 on he merely appends such admonitions and explanations as still remained for him to give to the church. But if this is so, the main purpose of chapters 1-3 cannot be found in the grateful retrospect of what God had hitherto done for the church, since all the letters of the apostle begin with that, or in the wishes for their further prosperity, which always follow closely on the thanksgiving (1:2-10; 3:11-13), but only in the sections of evidently apologetic character which stand between. The understanding of the epistle, and, consequently, the guaranty of its genuineness, turns accordingly on the question whether any occasion for these apologetic sections is perceptible.

Evidently this self-defense of the apostle is directed against slanders which had been circulated against him. The young Christians in Thessalonica had been told that they had been led

astray by cunning, ambitious, and self-seeking impostors; that only thus had they been alienated from their fellow-countrymen, from whom they were now suffering many a hardship and persecution. The burden of these hardships weighed heavily on the church and evidently gave the apostle great concern, since the young Christians had not yet proved themselves true under such a test. These slanderers declared that the apostles, for fear of being involved in these persecutions, had opportunely abandoned these whom they had betrayed and given them over to their fate; taking good care not themselves to return to the church. Only from this point of view does the whole section 2: 1—3: 10 appear in its true light and receive its right interpretation, as I have shown in the *kurzen Erläuterungen*. But the question arises, Whence did these slanders originate, from whom had they issued? This question has not yet been as satisfactorily and unanimously answered even by the defenders of the epistle as is necessary for its complete understanding.

There is indeed, both in the apology of the apostle and in the slanders which it presupposes, much that reminds us of the attacks which Paul endured in Corinth from his Jewish-Christian opponents. Since, however, it cannot be supposed that such opponents were to be found in this essentially Gentile church only recently established, Baur was right to a certain extent in finding here only imitations of the epistles to the Corinthians. But he neglected even to ask whether the analogous phenomena here could not perhaps be much better explained on wholly different grounds. Such a commentator as Hofmann and such a critic as von Soden (*Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 1885, No. 2) assume, to be sure, that those slanders issued from the unbelieving Gentile countrymen of the Christians in Thessalonica. But it cannot be conceived how it should come about that the converts of Paul and his companion should be at all affected by the opinions of those who when the Jewish missionaries were present paid no heed to them. All becomes clear when once it is recognized that it was the unbelieving Jews in Thessalonica who during the presence of the missionaries had sought to bring an accusation against them (Acts 17: 5–8), and now behind

their backs endeavored to undo their work. They were able to argue that they themselves surely knew their own countrymen better than these Gentiles newly converted to Christianity, and knowing them were in a position to affirm that they were deceivers and betrayers.

This suggestion is, moreover, obviously confirmed by the passage 2:15 ff. From the point of view of the current conception of the epistle Baur was right in declaring that the polemic against the Jews, which here suddenly breaks up all connection, was wholly unintelligible; and quite recently Schmiedel, who likewise thinks the slanders emanated rather from the Gentiles, has proposed to strike out these verses as a gloss. If, however, the attacks emanated from the unbelieving Jews, then it is clear why Paul ranks these slanders here with the efforts of the ungodly haters of the Gentiles who had tried on all occasions and in every way to obstruct his work of salvation among the heathen. Only from this point of view, moreover, is it possible to see why this severe polemic against the Jews closes with the statement that they had no need still further to fill up the measure of their sins by persecuting the messengers to the Gentiles, the [divine] wrath having already come upon them to the uttermost (vs. 16). So long as these words were referred to the destruction of Jerusalem, it followed, of course, that the epistle could not have been written by Paul, since he did not live long enough to witness this event. Even more recent defenders of the epistle make only random conjectures to account for these words. And yet there is but one clear and sure interpretation of them, and this recent critics also, like von Soden and Jülicher, have accepted. As Paul in Romans, chap. 1, sees the revelation of the divine wrath against the heathen world in its surrender to the folly of idolatry, to unnatural lust, and to a complete deadening of the moral sense, so he sees the wrath of God poured out upon unbelieving Israel in the judgment of hardening, of which he speaks in Rom. 11:7; 2 Cor. 3:14.

All that Paul says (chap. 1) in praise of the Christian standing of the Thessalonians and of the fame of their conversion to

Christianity is explained from the fact that he has in mind, by reference to the divine origin of Christianity and to the duty of guarding their good repute, to admonish them to endure with patience the persecutions that have befallen them. For manifestly their life as believers (for their perfecting in which he prays in 3:10) is deficient precisely in the fact that it still lacks that joyfulness which resists the trials of misfortune and which alone could establish their faith amid such trials. Further, the admonitions of chap. 4 show that the church was still lacking in the expression of its faith in practical life; that they still needed the warning against falling back into the old Gentile sins of unchastity and avarice (4:3-8). But it is just this that shows that we have here the picture of a church still young, much admired for the enthusiasm with which it had received the gospel, but now weighed down under the long continued persecutions and not yet sufficiently confirmed in moral life—a picture which no imitator of the apostle could invent and which is therefore in itself a guaranty of the genuineness of the epistle.

The eschatological discussions also (4:13—5:11) are easily understood if the pressure of persecution had raised to the highest pitch the desire for the return of the Lord, which alone could bring release. Exhortations, like 5:19 ff. carry us into the midst of church meetings roused to the highest pitch of feeling through such eschatological expectations. Prophets rise up who under a fanatical excitement declare the nearness of the second coming, while others oppose them with sober criticism, and, because prophecy had overstepped the bounds marked out for it, disparage it in general. Therefore the apostle is obliged to call attention to the fact that the day and hour of the parousia is and will remain unknown, and that we have only to take care that that time find us not unprepared (5:1-10). There were those also who under the influence of unwarranted expectation left their daily work professedly to spend their time in preparing for the parousia, which, as they thought, would end all things, thus becoming a burden on the charity of the church and even on that of their heathen countrymen. These are those

ἄτακτοι whom Paul (5:14) exhorts the church to admonish and to whom he directs his exhortation that, even when they do not themselves believe it necessary, they shall by all means work zealously, in order to be always gaining new means for more extensive labors of love, and not in the eyes of their unbelieving countrymen to bring disgrace upon Christianity through their idleness and beggary (4:10-12).

The discussion that follows (4:13-18), containing the most weighty eschatological material, brings us to the last point; and here also the epistle can be understood only in case it is genuine. Manifestly the church which at first, like Paul himself, had hoped while yet in its entirety to witness the parousia had through the first cases of death which occurred in its membership been thrown into the greatest distress. Since it cannot be supposed that a pseudonymous writer would make the apostle speak as if he hoped himself to be alive at the parousia (whereas he actually passed away before that event) the alarm implied in 4:13 is wholly inexplicable as the product of a period subsequent to that of the apostle, since the Christians of later times must certainly in some way have come to accept the fact that many would not survive to witness the parousia. When the resurrection had become a permanent part of the common hope of Christianity for the future, nothing could have been gained by an appeal to the awakening of those who sleep preceding the glorification of those who survive. These discussions can be understood only on the assumption that the apostle is explaining these things in detail to a new church, to which he, believing the parousia to be near at hand, had as yet had no occasion to speak of the fate of those who might perhaps die before the parousia, or to a congregation in which the antipathy of the Hellenic mind to this element of Christian doctrine (*cf.* Acts 17:32; 1 Cor. 15:12) had prevented their hearing or understanding his allusions to the parousia. It will then also appear what word of the Lord it is to which Paul appeals; and this is all the more important because those who have attempted to refer the epistle to a later time have taken advantage of the uncertainty which prevails regarding this term. Inasmuch as

the apostle by no means asserts that this word of the Lord contains all that he set forth (vs. 16 ff.), but only affirms on the authority of it that those who survive will not precede those who sleep, it is entirely sufficient to refer to Matt. 24:31, where Jesus promises at his parousia to gather his elect about himself from the four winds, hence all together. Second Thessalonians also makes allusion to this promise (2:1).

If thus the genuineness of the epistle appears fully confirmed, this yields from another point of view a highly important result for the criticism of the Pauline epistles in general. It was one of the fundamental errors of Baur's criticism that a doctrinal system based on the four epistles accepted by him was made the standard for determining what else should be recognized as Pauline. But those letters indeed show a form of teaching so related in content and expression only because the epistles to the Galatians and Corinthians are directed toward the same Jewish-Christian opposition, while the epistle to the Romans represents the results of that same struggle. Besides, all four were written in a period of three and one-half years, three of them within a period of less than a year. And yet the doctrine of salvation characteristic of the apostle even in them varies greatly in proportion and degree, while uniform development in other doctrinal topics is out of the question. But it is in itself contrary to all historical probability that Paul immediately upon his conversion worked out an original system of doctrine, or even that doctrine of salvation which later was developed in so profound a way. When, in Gal. 1:23, we read that the churches of Judea had heard say: "He that once persecuted us now preacheth the faith of which he once made havoc," it is evident that at this time there must have been no essential difference between his type of doctrine and that of the original apostles. It was probably rather the struggle with the Judaizer that forced him to develop his doctrine of salvation with such precision and sharpness, and to elaborate all its premises and consequences, and to express it in such bold propositions and striking terminology.

That such was in fact the case the first epistle to the Thessalonians proves most clearly. It is extremely interesting to see

how assiduously the most recent defenders of the epistles, Paul Schmidt and von Soden, reject the idea that it contains an undeveloped form of Pauline doctrine; and yet this is unquestionably the fact. It is, of course, true that even here those peculiarities of his doctrine which are connected with the peculiar character of his conversion come to light. Christ, of course, is to him the exalted Lord from whom comes all salvation just as from God himself; but there are no Christological statements furnishing more explicit information of the nature and origin of his person; there is no detailed exposition of the atoning significance of his death, which is touched upon only in a general statement, such as 5: 10. Of course, even thus early Christianity is to him a divine dispensation of grace, but nowhere is the inability of the natural man to work out his own salvation, which such a doctrine called for, explained or traced back to the power of sin in the flesh; of justification by faith and not by works there is nowhere any mention; nor is the attitude of the Christian toward the law of the Old Testament and the relation of Jew and Gentile to salvation in Christ spoken of, although the way in which the unbelieving Jews tried to undermine Paul's work must certainly have furnished occasion enough for it. The doctrine of the Spirit who through the Word produces faith in the elect, and the new life in the believer, already has, it is true, an important place; but of the vital fellowship with Christ, secured by the Spirit, of the completion of salvation guaranteed by him, which gave to the apostle's developed system of thought such a peculiar stamp, there is as yet no trace. So much is certain: The critic who makes the theology of the four great doctrinal and controversial epistles the standard for all that is to be recognized as Pauline cannot accept the first epistle to the Thessalonians as genuine. In this Baur has been more consistent than the more recent criticism, which declares this epistle to be genuine, and then, nevertheless, rejects as spurious other epistles which in a much higher measure than it bear the stamp of developed Paulinism, because they are unwilling to admit that there was an advance beyond the point of view of the four great epistles.

## II. THE SECOND EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS.

It is very interesting to see how the epistles to the Thessalonians still show clear traces of the fact that Paul began in them his correspondence with his churches. Even the so-called address of the epistles shows a form much simpler, and in many respects peculiar, as compared with that of the later epistles which the address of the second approaches in one particular. In the first epistle the apostle enjoins the officers in whose charge the letter was sent to read it to the whole body of the brethren, consequently in full church assembly (5:27). In the second he hints at a misuse which had been made of letters professedly written by himself (2:2), and declares that, therefore, he intends henceforth to certify each one of his letters with a subscription in his own handwriting (3:17). In view of this fact, Weizsäcker, who still regards our letter as spurious, admits that it certainly becomes thereby an actual forgery. We can no longer speak in this case of pseudonymous writing, alleged in Christian antiquity to have been a wholly innocuous proceeding; here is a shrewd forgery which endeavors, by means of marks of genuineness borrowed from the later Pauline epistles (*cf.* 1 Cor. 16:21), to stamp a forged document as an epistle of Paul.

Recent criticism has been unprejudiced enough to acknowledge that, perhaps with the exception of the eschatological sections in chap. 2, there is no reason for denying the epistle to the apostle. Since Ewald the attempt has repeatedly been made to reverse the order of the two epistles. In fact, however, not only is this indefensible, but the second letter, by its relation to the first, discloses a situation so transparent that this itself vouches for the genuineness of the letter. It was written soon after the first, to which 2:15 clearly refers. The church has remained true, but the increased burden of persecution has also increased the enthusiastic expectation of the parousia to its highest pitch. The apostle is obliged to say to them that they appear to have forgotten entirely what signs must necessarily precede the appearance of the Lord. Those religious idlers whom the first

epistle more indirectly reprimands compel him, by their failure to return to their duty, to inflict on them some disciplinary punishment. No motive can be discovered which would explain the forging of such a document in the name of an apostle. The numerous similarities to the first epistle are explained by the fact that the second was written very soon after the first; but it must be conceded that, if grounds of suspicion in other respects are produced, these can be ascribed to imitation. And if umbrage is to be taken at every peculiar expression the epistle will afford opportunity for this also. Attention has been called to the expression *δφείλομεν εὐχαριστεῖν*, repeatedly occurring in the second epistle (1:3; 2:13), whereas the first epistle, like all others, says *εὐχαριστοῦμεν* (1:2; 2:13); to 3:15, *ὁ κύριος τῆς εἰρήνης*, and 2:13, *ἡγαπημένοι ὑπὸ κυρίου*, instead of which the first epistle writes *ὁ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης* (5:23) and *ἡγαπημένοι ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ*; to the anarthrous *terminus technicus* *ἡμέρα κυρίου* (1 Thess. 5:2), which appears in the second letter as *ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου* (2:2) or takes, as in the gospels, the form *ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη*; and these divergencies have often been regarded as indications of spuriousness. This is certainly unjustified. But it is of significance that recent critics have at length learned to take no notice of such peculiarities of a document. Thus, for example, both epistles have in common the expression *ἔργον τῆς πίστεως* (1 Thess. 1:3; 2 Thess. 2:11), and the characterization of the calling as a *continuing* divine work of grace (1 Thess. 2:12; 2 Thess. 1:11); and yet critics have taken no offense at the first epistle. It is very instructive to observe how even these earliest epistles show each their own peculiar forms of expression, in comparison with one another as well as with the later epistles. Although Paul certainly developed a dogmatic terminology of his own, yet it never became anything like a fetter to his versatile spirit. Every epistle has in this respect its own peculiarities, and it is very perilous to make these considerations decisive in settling the question of genuineness.

Criticism has always regarded the eschatological sections of chap. 2 as constituting the real problem of the second epistle to the Thessalonians. It must be recognized, indeed,

that the contradictions which are alleged to exist between it and the eschatology of the first epistle are easily explained. For that the day of the Lord comes as a thief in the night (1 Thess. 5:2) does not preclude his coming being accompanied with signs whose appearance is as impossible to foresee as that day itself; and that Paul himself still hopes to witness the parousia (1 Thess. 4:15) does not demand so immediate an occurrence of the day that the signs predicted in 2 Thess., chap. 2, could not precede it. That, moreover, the unbelieving will be led astray by the Antichrist (2 Thess. 2:10 f.) has nothing whatever to do with the fact that they will live until the dawn of the day of the Lord in peace and safety, and will have no presentiment of the approaching destruction (1 Thess. 5:3), but can at most intensify this feeling of security. What the apostle is aiming at is simply to call to the minds of the Thessalonians what he would have them remember his having previously said to them about the appearance of the Antichrist, which must precede the return of the Lord, and about that which, as they knew, still retarded that event. We have here, as in the Apocalypse of John and, in a certain sense, in the apocalyptic discourse of Jesus, an apocalyptic picture of the form in which godlessness must reach its highest point before the final judgment can be ushered in; for that this must happen first Jesus has already clearly declared in Matt. 23:32 ff. Such apocalyptic pictures must, however, necessarily relate themselves to existing circumstances. Their purpose is simply to interpret the signs of the times, searching for the point at which the hatred towards God, which is heaping up for itself wrath against the day of judgment, will manifest itself. If it be assumed that we have here the same situation as in the Johannean apocalypse, according to its usual interpretation, then the returning Nero is here the Antichrist, and the epistle could have been written only after his death, hence is in no sense a writing of Paul. To Kern, who first endeavored to establish the spuriousness of the epistle on substantial grounds, this was the really decisive argument, and the same was true of Baur and his followers. The more recent defenders of the epistle have contested this view;

but they have not been able to overcome it because they started from a wholly colorless conception of the Pauline picture. The apostle's picture of the Antichrist expected by him is said to contain only general features and such as are borrowed from Daniel and Jewish apocalyptic literature. There floated also before his mind, perhaps, a picture of a Roman emperor like Caligula. But this view takes too little account of the very concrete manner in which the apostle describes his eschatological expectation. He speaks of an ἀποστασία, out of which the man of sin rises up, to advance to the point of blasphemous self-apotheosis. The apostle knows of a "hindrance" which still delays this development and compels the ἀνομία to conceal its true nature in a mystery until the κατέχων is removed out of the way. Then will come the full revelation of the ἄνομος, who in Satanic power leads the unbelievers astray with lying wonders and every sort of unrighteous deception, but whose appearance causes the immediate return of the true Messiah who brings to an abrupt end the career of the Antichrist (2:3-10).

If there is no better interpretation of this picture than that adopted by the more recent defenders of the epistle, the evidence of its genuineness must be acknowledged to be weak. But there is another way. Starting with the interpretation of the κατέχων, it is pretty generally agreed that this term can be understood only of the imperial and judicial power of Rome; and this is manifestly confirmed by the fact that the neuter of the word "hindrance" (κατέχων) is used interchangeably with the masculine, ὁ κατέχων, which can refer only to the incarnation of that imperial power in the person of the Roman emperor (2:6, 7). But in that case the view that finds the Antichrist, whose appearance is retarded by "the restrainer" (ὁ κατέχων), in a Roman emperor or a character copied after the picture of such a one is excluded at the outset. If now, as is actually the case, the Johannean Apocalypse expects the Antichrist (not to be sure in the fabled return of Nero, but in an incarnation of the Roman imperial power), and if, as is clear, the reason assigned for this is that in the Neronian persecution of the Christians the Roman Empire had once already shown itself as the instrument

of the hostility to God and Christ, then it is clear that we have here an older apocalyptic combination which can have originated only in the time of Paul. And this is confirmed by the fact that in the Johannean Apocalypse the false prophet advances *along with* the beast, which represents the Antichrist himself, preparing the way for him by means of his lying wonders and his deception, and inducing mankind to apostatize to him. In Second Thessalonians, however, the Antichrist himself is the false prophet, who with lying wonders of Satan and fiendish deception leads mankind astray (2:9, 10)—from which it is again clear that he cannot be a Roman emperor.

What Paul's more exact thought about the appearance of this Antichrist was is clear from the relation in which that appearance (2:6) stands to the apostasy. It is quite out of the question to look for such a thing in the realm of heathenism, which neither knows nor worships God (1:8). On the other hand our epistles nowhere show any apprehension of an apostasy in the realm of Christianity, and certainly furnish no occasion for thinking of such a thing in the present passage. Thus Judaism only remains, which Paul in the first epistle (2:14-16) represented as the incarnation of all enmity to God and Christ; and which, if it continued on this way, must inevitably in the end apostatize wholly from God (*cf.* Heb. 3:12). The consummation of this apostasy, however, necessarily involved not only a persecution of the true Messiah (in his confessors) by the Jews, but the setting up over against him of the false Messiah. Therefore the false Messiah must be the Antichrist. This apocalyptic picture connects itself immediately with the prophecy of Jesus, which, as may be inferred from 1 Thess. 4:15; 2 Thess. 2:1, was already known to the apostle; only he thinks of the *ψευδόχριστοι* and *ψευδοπροφῆται* of whom Christ had spoken (Matt. 24:24; *cf.* John 5:43) as culminating in the person of the false Messiah, *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, who is identical with the false prophet. With this view and with this only can the description in 2:4, which plainly does not fit in with the apotheosis of the Roman emperor, be made to agree. Never did such an one, when causing himself to be numbered among the gods, set up the claim

of being higher than all the other gods, and thereby announce his intention to contend with all others, as it is asserted that the ἀντικείμενος καὶ ὑπεραιρόμενος ἐπὶ πάντα λεγόμενον θεὸν ἢ σέβασμα does. The very fact that what the passage speaks of is rather an assumption of equality with the one supreme God, on the part of one who endures no other gods beside him (not even the alleged Messiah revered by the Christians), shows doubtless that it is in the temple of God (at Jerusalem), where he takes his seat in order to prove thereby that he is of divine nature. Unbelieving Judaism had already found a blasphemous self-apotheosis in the claim of Jesus to the Messiahship (Mark 14:64; cf. John 5:18; 10:33), and so the false Messiah sets up the claim that he is the one in whom Jehovah himself comes to his people (Luke 1:17, 76), and who, according to Mal. 3:1, appears in his temple, the highest revelation of God, a consubstantial representative of God.

But the apostle also indicates very clearly why he expects the Antichrist in the false Messiah, when he sees (2:7) the mystery of the ἀνομία already in operation. It surely cannot be that by this the immorality of heathenism is meant,—this is well known to everyone,—but only the Jewish hostility to Christ (1 Thess. 2:15 ff.), which parades itself still under the name of zeal for God and his law, when it persecutes the messengers of the gospel, and is nevertheless in its innermost essence a repudiation of the divine will (revealed in the Messiah). It was, moreover, as we know from the Acts of the Apostles, the Roman judicial power which constantly protected the apostle from the attacks of Jewish fanaticism. But when it came to this, that the final apostasy of Judaism culminated in the epiphany of the false Messiah, and he with the power of Satan overthrew the imperial power of Rome in the person of its representatives, for the purpose of gaining for himself and his people the world power, then indeed a path would be made for Antichristianity to complete the annihilation of Christianity, then would the measure of sin be full, and then the returning of the Messiah must needs bring this career of lawlessness to an end. Thus the apocalyptic combination, so far from being inconceivable in the Pauline time, is

comprehensible only as proceeding from that time, when unbelieving Judaism was still the sole enemy with which the apostle contended in accomplishing his world mission.

The only thing to be urged with plausibility against this interpretation of 2 Thess., chap. 2, which is not only possible but exegetically necessary is that Paul, in Rom. 11:25 f., hopes for a complete restoration of Israel; therefore, it may be urged, he cannot have thought of the Antichrist as being the product of the final apostasy of Judaism. But as these apocalyptic pictures have always historical situations as their background, they must also change with them. Time and hour of Christ's parousia no one knows at all (Mark 13:32); but it is to be expected at any time, and each interpreter must therefore seek to determine from the signs of his own time the form in which the highest personification of the enmity to Christ will appear. Only the end of the days will show which of these personifications is actually the final one. Paul lived long enough to see that unbelieving Judaism was not able to prevent the victorious progress (2 Thess. 3:1) of the gospel throughout heathendom, that quite other forces, within Christianity, threatened its development; and it is one of the most significant signs of the time that in the epistle to the Romans he has returned to the hope of the complete restoration of Israel cherished by the primitive apostles. The same was true of the apostle John. Under the vivid impression of the horrors of a bloody persecution he saw in his apocalypse the personification of the hostility to Christ in a representative of the empire restored after the days of the interregnum. But soon it turned out that this power too was unable to cope with Christianity, mighty in its spirituality, and in his epistles John sees the Antichrist only in the false doctrine which, arising within the Christian church, denied the incarnation of the Son of God (1 John 2:18; 4:3).

### III. THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

The epistle to the Galatians was the Archimedes' fulcrum by means of which the critics of the Tübingen school believed they had overthrown the conception of the conditions of the

apostolic times, handed down from the time of the Acts of the Apostles. It was therefore an act of courage when Steck directed his attack against the genuineness of the epistle, and though the positive arguments which he believed he had found, for the spuriousness of the epistle are so weak as to require no detailed discussion, yet he has shown irrefutably that the historical conditions of the epistle to the Galatians have not been determined with sufficient clearness to justify the assurance with which the Tübingen school boasts of its genuineness.

This holds true, to begin with, of the question concerning the founding of the Galatian church. In our day, as is well known, Hausrath has revived, and others have defended, the view first brought forward by Mynster, that the epistle was addressed to churches in Pisidia and Lycaonia, founded on the first missionary journey of the apostle, this region having been, after the death of the last Galatian king, included in the Roman province of Galatia. But the adoption of this view carries with it the assignment of the epistle to a chronological position different from that commonly accepted, and requires us to suppose that in all probability it was written shortly after the beginning of the second missionary tour of the apostle, in any event, quite a long time before the epistles to the Thessalonians. But although Steck maintains that the location of the Galatian churches cannot be determined with certainty, and inclines to the opinion of Hausrath, yet it must be regarded as very improbable that Paul should have addressed the people of Pisidia and Lycaonia as Galatians (Gal. 3:1) because they at that time belonged politically to Galatia. The only argument for this view having even *prima facie* value, namely, that he used this term to gather together under one general name the people of various districts, is an utterly worthless subterfuge; for Paul, who so very rarely addressed his readers by name, was under no necessity of doing so here if he had no fitting collective designation for them. Moreover, the churches founded in company with Barnabas, and before the so-called Jerusalem council, had, without question, a considerable Jewish-Christian element, while the churches to which our epistle was addressed are represented as

essentially Gentile Christian in character. Nevertheless it can be urged with a certain show of truth that although the existence of churches in Galatia proper is presupposed in Acts 18:23, yet of their founding we have no definite knowledge; for, according to Acts 16:6, Paul seems to have traveled through Galatia without stopping; so that the assertion that Gal. 4:13 refers to a stay there, during which these churches were founded, appears by no means to be established.

But this is simply a case in which the flagrant carelessness with which it is customary to treat the statements of the Acts of the Apostles as to the roads which the apostle traveled to Troas is avenged. There is indeed no question that the Acts intends to describe the apostle as going forward, not according to his own plan, but driven by the Spirit, and unable to tarry anywhere in Asia Minor until he reached the seacoast at Troas, where he received the divine intimation which directed him to Macedonia. It is expressly said of Asia and Bithynia that the Spirit prevented him from preaching there, although this was plainly his purpose. But we cannot think of such an intimation of the Spirit being wholly arbitrary; and since Paul later repeatedly emphasizes the fact that it is his principle—his, that is to say, taught him by the Spirit—not to build upon another man's foundation (2 Cor. 10:15 f.; Rom. 15:20), with which also agrees the fact that he regarded it as the peculiar task of his apostolic office to found churches (1 Cor. 3:10), we must infer that apostolic activity in these regions was forbidden him by the Spirit, because there were already churches founded there by the primitive apostles; and this is expressly affirmed by 1 Peter 1:1 with respect to Asia and Bithynia. To be sure this is not admitted by recent critics, nor even by those who acknowledge the first epistle of Peter to be genuine, because they have committed themselves to the opinion that the epistle was written to Gentile-Christian churches in the province of Asia; and yet this can be maintained only by extreme exegetical violence to the address of the epistle. In the entire ancient church it was never questioned that the elect strangers belonging to the dispersion of Asia Minor were Jewish Christians. If it is still insisted that we

have no knowledge of churches in Asia Minor founded by the mother church, this overlooks the fact that outside of the Acts of the Apostles, which, according to its plan, deals only with the Pauline mission, we have no information at all of the extension of Christianity. We know, however, that both the primitive apostles and the brothers of the Lord had actually made missionary journeys (naturally among the dispersion; *cf.* 1 Cor. 9: 5); besides which it must be taken into account that the seed of Christianity might often have been scattered from Palestine among the dispersion in other ways than by the direct missionary activity of the apostles themselves.

To be sure 1 Peter 1: 1 excludes a Pauline mission in Galatia as truly as one in Asia and Bithynia; but Gal. 4: 13 says clearly enough that Paul did not go to Galatia to do there missionary work, but that his stay there when he made known the gospel to the Galatians was occasioned by physical weakness. The intimation given to the apostle by the Spirit can be understood only as meaning that he must not inaugurate his apostolic work where foundations had already been laid; but not in the sense that his mouth must be closed if for other reasons he stopped anywhere. The probability is that, his sickness having made it necessary for him to stay a while in Galatia, he took advantage of this enforced delay to make the gospel known there. Besides, Galatia was surely large enough to give him, even outside of the larger cities in which the Jewish dispersion resided, opportunity for an extended stay and the preaching of the gospel among the Gentile people. It is, to be sure, very remarkable that the Acts of the Apostles does *not* say of Galatia and Phrygia, in which 18: 23 doubtless implies that there are Pauline churches, that he was hindered from preaching the gospel there (16: 6); but only that he traveled through. But the reason of this is that the writer avoids mentioning the fruit of his labors here, which fell to him only incidentally, in order to represent Macedonia as the real divinely designated goal of his missionary journey.

We must, therefore, still hold that Paul founded the Galatian churches on his second missionary journey, and when he visited them for the second time (Acts 18: 23) he found them already

troubled over the question of the law. If he hoped simply by emphatically repudiating all efforts which had for their object to bring them into subjection to the law to protect them against such errors, he must have learned all too soon that his efforts were in vain. After his departure the situation became still more threatening, and the churches were on the point of utter apostasy. Steck is also undoubtedly right in maintaining that these events, as they are represented in our epistle, are difficult to explain if it is genuine; at least they are not made clear by the prevailing conception of the epistle. It is commonly thought that this first trouble of the churches came in through Jewish-Christian agitators, who had come down from Jerusalem. But there is not the least indication of this in the epistle, and in fact it is difficult to explain why these Judaizers should have sought out precisely these purely Gentile-Christian churches in so distant a region, which offered them no vantage ground for their attack.

So far as I know Franke (*Studien und Kritiken*, 1883, I) is the only one who up to the present time has called attention to these difficulties and sought to explain the first perplexity of the churches, though to be sure by a very improbable hypothesis. After what we have established concerning the founding of the Galatian churches there is absolutely no need of any special hypothesis whatsoever to explain this. If there were old-established Jewish-Christian communities in Galatia it was entirely natural that these, who on their side held fast to the law, should seek to induce the young Gentile Christians in their neighborhood likewise to submit themselves to the law. They had nothing to say against the doctrine of salvation preached to the Gentiles and the blessings received through faith. They did not at all enter into a discussion of doctrinal differences, whether of faith and works or of universalism and particularism; their only concern was that the Gentiles should by circumcision and acceptance of the law become Jews, it being impossible from the point of view of Jewish Christians that the Gentile should share in the fullness of salvation promised to Israel except on these conditions. Paul had, however, taught that *all* the salvation

brought by Christ and to be expected from him is obtained through faith alone; and when he found them in a state of unrest in consequence of the requirements which the Jewish Christians urged, and defended apparently on so natural grounds, the apostle, without entering further into the question of divine authority, pronounced an anathema on all who should preach any other gospel, that is, on making salvation dependent on anything else whatsoever than faith.

If, now, one considers the apostle mainly as a dogmatician wholly occupied in maintaining against the primitive apostles certain theses of his, his course in this matter is very strange. When, however, we observe both from the speech at Athens and from the first epistle to the Thessalonians how simple was his preaching of salvation among the Gentiles, how far he was from comparing this with the law and the Jewish claims, then it is easy to conceive that he would certainly not have annoyed the Galatians with a discussion of questions which it was difficult to make perfectly clear to them, and that he simply pointed out to them the fact that the gospel which deviates from that brought to them by their apostle was *eo ipso* worthy to be anathematized. Certainly he did not accomplish his object, but almost the very opposite. And at this point, even Franke believes, there must be assumed an interference by Judaistic emissaries from Jerusalem, who caused the change in the churches. But the epistle contradicts this most decidedly, unless 5:10 be misinterpreted in the most absurd way. How can Paul ask who has bewitched them (3:1), if it was perfectly evident that it was those emissaries? On the contrary, it is entirely clear (4:17 f.) that the same people now court them as formerly did so during his presence among them. In fact there need not have been any direct interference on the part of such Jewish agitators; but because Paul had based his repudiation of the Jewish-Christian demand solely on his apostolic authority, it was obvious to ask whence he then had that authority. He could have received it, it would be said, only from the primitive apostles, who themselves held to the law and the promise given to Israel; and if he preached a gospel which refused to recognize these, then, it

was claimed, he changed the original message of salvation while they with their demands remained true to it. Thus, therefore, Paul was forced after all to discuss the question of the law and to prove the divine origin of his gospel. If he had received it, not from the primitive apostles, but through an immediate revelation (chap. 1); if the primitive apostles themselves acknowledged that he had been entrusted with this gospel to the Gentiles; and if he had vindicated it successfully even against Peter (chap. 2), then it was only necessary for him incidentally to refute the allegation that he had received his apostleship solely from the primitive apostles (1:1), for he had been called by God himself to the apostleship to the Gentiles (1:15). There is, moreover, not the slightest intimation that he is reminding them only of things which he had long ago told them, or that he is correcting misrepresentation. On the contrary he now for the first time relates to them these historical events, certainly not in order to defend his apostolic dignity, as is still supposed by many, but in order to prove the divine origin of his gospel, with the preaching of which he had been entrusted by God alone, and not by man.

The same is true of the whole subsequent doctrinal section. The apostle's purpose is not to defend his doctrine of justification, as is so often assumed, but to show how the claim that the promised salvation is secured only through subjection to the law completely destroys the foundation of his doctrine of salvation, which bases justification, adoption, and the inheritance of full salvation upon faith in redemption through Christ alone; the whole Christian dispensation of grace is denied if the salvation promised in it is dependent upon any human work whatever; and in confirmation of this he appeals to their own Christian experience (3:1-5). He does not fail also to show how the freedom from the law, which accordingly is to be steadfastly maintained, does not permit continuance in sin, but only secures in a new way the fulfillment of the will of God revealed in the law, through the working of the Spirit given to them. Surely if he preached these same doctrines from the beginning, Steck is quite right in saying that it is entirely inconceivable how his letter could at one stroke have effected what his preach-

ing had failed to accomplish. But the historical significance of the epistle to the Galatians consists precisely in the fact that here for the first time the apostle was under the necessity of exposing with all logical acumen the perilous and subversive character of the seemingly so well founded demand made by the Judaists, and of proving that the Old Testament itself bears witness not for but against this demand.

It is remarkable how radical criticism, which controverts the genuineness of the epistle to the Galatians, has only served to bring the Acts of the Apostles back again to a place of honor. Steck shows how the assumption of the Tübingen school, that the Acts, in the interest of its "tendency," misrepresents the historical events which Paul discusses (Gal., chaps. 1, 2) is thoroughly untenable. Granted that the Acts was insufficiently informed on many points concerning the early career of Paul, granted that, in accordance with the pragmatism that dominates it, it has represented some things in a one-sided and therefore incomplete way, yet in estimating its variations from the account given by Paul it must not be overlooked that Paul also presents these historical events only from a certain historical point of view, and touches only on those points which he can use to break the force of the charges which had been made against him. If it be regarded as entirely impossible that Paul should fail to mention to the Galatians the restrictions which, according to Acts, chap. 15, were imposed upon the Gentile Christians, it does not follow that the Acts of the Apostles has invented these things, but at most that it has erroneously combined the transactions of Paul with the primitive apostles, of which Gal., chap. 2, gives an account, with transactions within the primitive church, of which its sources treated; on which sources Acts, chap. 15, is clearly enough based.

Still another point is made clear by Steck which is of great significance for the criticism of the Pauline epistles. To be sure the view that the law (3:19) is degraded and belittled as an imperfect institution given by angels rests upon a wholly untenable exegesis. But so much is correct, that this statement about the law recurs nowhere else in the Pauline epistles. And if only

that is to be accepted as Pauline for which there are analogies in the other principal epistles of Paul, then the same considerations which are urged against other shorter epistles of Paul may also be urged against the epistle to the Galatians. And this argument may be applied in still another direction. The epistle to the Galatians has recently been explained as the latest of the Pauline epistles, because here the antithesis between Paulinism and Judaism is at its sharpest (*cf.* C. Clemen, *Die Chronologie der paulinischen Briefe*, Halle, 1893), whereas on the contrary nothing is more natural than that in the apostle's first daring effort to show the incompatibility of the Jewish claims with his doctrine of salvation he should express this antithesis as sharply as possible, even if later he found reason to modify it.

It is remarkable how little it has been observed that the chief differences between our epistle and the later ones pertain to quite a different matter. Steck has very correctly seen that here Judaism is in a certain sense put upon the same level with heathenism, though not, to be sure, in the way in which he, following the current misinterpretation of *στοιχία*, maintains, but as a rudimentary religion such as we should look for at an early stage in the development of mankind. But what is surprising in this is not his judgment of Judaism, which he has all along regarded as the preparatory step in the economy of salvation, but his judgment of heathenism. If it be observed how in Rom., chap. 1, he sees in the present condition of the heathen world the judgment of divine wrath on the original apostasy of heathenism from primitive religion, how he in the first epistle to the Corinthians sees in heathenism an abandonment to the demoniacal powers (10:20; 12:2), it must be admitted that this estimate of heathenism is certainly wholly different from that expressed in the epistle to the Galatians. If one is unwilling to assume a development in the views of Paul, but feels compelled to ascribe to the apostle a fixed and permanent dogmatic system, then there must be admitted the spuriousness either of the epistle to the Galatians or of the principal letters which follow it. But indeed neither of these positions is held by recent criticism. And so the fact of the genuineness of the epistle, which the attacks of

radical criticism have only served to establish more firmly, leads, if we take occasion from these attacks to make a fresh investigation of the circumstances that gave rise to the epistle, simply to a revision of the general principles on which all recent criticism works.

#### IV. THE EPISTLES TO THE CORINTHIANS.

The first epistle to the Corinthians, similar in this respect to the epistles to the Thessalonians, contains the guaranty of its genuineness in the fact that in it there is presented to us a picture of this the first church founded on Greek soil, which shows most vividly all the excellencies and all the weaknesses of the Hellenic character. Hence church meetings with their wealth of spiritual gifts, of which vanity and the passion for pre-eminence took advantage for their own ends, leading to strife over the superiority of the various gifts, in which even the Lord's Supper itself was profaned by the existence of cliques and gluttony. Hence also the fondness of the Corinthian Christians for going to law, and for associating with their unbelieving countrymen by which they were continually entangled again in the old Gentile sins of the luxurious commercial metropolis. Hence also the inclination in the face of the mockery of their fellow-men to sacrifice even the belief in the resurrection; above all, the excessive party spirit which engendered strife over the boasted merits of the various teachers. But Steck is right in maintaining that just in this matter the real state of affairs is far from having been sufficiently cleared up to enable us to arrive at a full historical understanding of the epistle. Even the opinion that we have to do here with various parties within the church is by no means dead, and cannot be refuted so long as one fails to recognize that the so-called "Petrinists" (1 Cor. 1:13) were really pupils of Peter who had been converted under his preaching. This presupposes, to be sure, that Peter had at some time come to Corinth in the course of his missionary journeys. I have always maintained that the account given by Dionysius of Corinth of a ministry of Peter in that city had, in spite of its rhetorical exaggerations, an historical reminiscence as its basis,

and Harnack has recently unequivocally acknowledged the very great probability of this view.

But the so-called Christ party is, as it always has been, the chief crux of the exegetes, and of late they are disposed, despairing of its solution, to get rid of it altogether by exegetical or critical expedients. The older theories about this party, to be sure, being without foundation and mutually contradictory, accomplished nothing. But Baur years ago pointed out the only right way when he combined the party cry of certain people who said of themselves: ἐγὼ [εἰμι] Χριστοῦ (1:22), with 2 Cor. 10:17. It is also being recognized more and more nowadays that according to the analogy of the party cries of the other parties this can be put into the mouth of such only as were personal disciples of Christ or pretended to be. But while Baur regarded them as a party who stood for the primitive apostles in opposition to Paul, Holsten admitted that the ψευδαπόστολοι and ὑπερλίαν ἀπόστολοι whom Paul combated were, according to the context, not the original apostles, but the members of this Christ party, who on the ground of their relationship to Christ as against Paul made the claim that they were the only true apostles; and consequently they who made this their cry were not members of the Christian church, but the agitators who had come to the church from Jerusalem. Paul does not at all say (1:11 f.) that there were four parties in Corinth, but that disputes were there in which each one boasted of his special teacher; and that he meant to include with the three others the party cry of the Christ party as one that greatly aggravated and embittered the conflict of parties is made incontestably clear by the fact that at the close of the section directed against these parties he deals also with those τινές who boasted that when such people as they had appeared in Corinth Paul would not venture to come again to Corinth (4:18; cf. vs. 6). To be sure we gain our first definite knowledge of these people only from the second epistle, but it would have been very shortsighted of Paul to have begun his polemic against them before they had disclosed their ultimate aim and their resources for accomplishing it (yet cf. 9:1 f.).

But above all Steck is to a certain extent right in maintain-

ing that there still remains much to be done for the elucidation of the meaning of the second epistle and of its relation to the first before we shall have a firm basis for the proof of the genuineness of our epistle. And at this point the criticism which proceeds on the basis of the genuineness of the epistle has found itself becoming entangled in a maze from which there appears no way of escape except that of radical criticism. Bleek was satisfied to assume a lost letter between the two that we have, which Paul had sent by the hand of Titus and to which our second epistle refers. That was indeed in itself not an impossible view, since 1 Cor. 5:9 also undoubtedly refers to a letter now lost, sent before our first; but it was unfortunate that the controversy over this question should immediately be connected with the question whether 2 Cor. 2:5-10; 7:12 refer to the affair treated in First Corinthians or to an affront to the apostle, *i. e.*, in the person of his messenger, which was offered on the occasion of the visit of Titus to Corinth; on this question the various defenders of the hypothesis of an intermediate letter have not been able to agree. Furthermore there was a growing inclination to place the second visit of the apostle to Corinth, presupposed in the second epistle, between the first and second letters, rather than before our first epistle, as was generally held formerly, and is still maintained by many of the defenders of the intermediate letter, *e. g.*, Schmiedel. But Schmiedel himself, who in the introduction to his exposition of the epistle in Holtzmann's *Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament* has with great acuteness made a thorough examination of every hypothesis that has been proposed, recognized the difficulties which beset this theory of an intermediate letter, and was compelled, reviving an old view, to assume still another visit of Titus to Corinth with a letter from the apostle; so that there were two epistles between our first and second, both of which have been lost.

Finally, the complication of this hypothesis reached its highest point with Hausrath, who believed that he had found in the last four chapters of the second epistle to the Corinthians the intermediate letter so commonly assumed; in which

conjecture Schmiedel has recently followed him with great positiveness, while other defenders of the intermediate letter protest emphatically against this opinion. This was the signal for a general attempt to dissect our second epistle. Even earlier some had declared the section 6:14—7:1 to be spurious, while others thought they could discover in it the epistle written before our first. Now it was proposed to find also in chaps. 8 and 9 fragments of the two intermediate letters. Finally Halmet thought he could extract from our epistle still another epistle of four chapters, 2:14—6:10, which was written later than the first (chaps. 10—13); so that only a very small part of our epistle still remained. Again criticism has lost itself in a labyrinth of hypotheses, out of which there is no escape. For it is clear that simply by newly arranging these epistles or epistolary fragments and journeys or missions an equal number of new hypotheses can with a little acuteness be set up against those already advanced, with just as good or just as bad a foundation as they. We have here the same great fault of our modern criticism that is manifest in other fields also, *e. g.*, in the criticism of the Acts of the Apostles and of the Apocalypse, viz., that it transgresses the boundaries of the scientifically demonstrable, and confounds the products of fancy with scientifically established results. Had the facts been as any one of these hypotheses assumes, it would have been impossible to ascertain them with scientific exactness. An hypothesis is justifiable only when the documents in hand imperatively demand it. That this is not the case is shown by the fact that every hypothesis requires a new supplementary hypothesis to make it conceivable. Even Holtzmann has said that the close relationship of the second epistle to the first must always make it doubtful whether the interlacing and mutually contradictory hypotheses of unrecorded journeys and lost letters, which of necessity extend the interval between the two existing letters, can be substantiated. We are thus driven to inquire whether after all it is not better to reject all these hypotheses and return to the view that the second epistle to the Corinthians was written shortly after the first.

What originally suggested the idea of a journey of the apostle

to Corinth between the first and second letters to the Corinthians was the fact that in the second epistle the visit to Corinth which he was about to make is designated as the third, from which it follows that in addition to the stay of a year and one-half (Acts 18:11), during which he founded the church, he must also have made another visit before writing the second letter. This visit, it has been supposed, must have taken place *after* our first epistle, since the latter does not mention it at all. But this opinion is by no means necessary. If this visit preceded the letter mentioned in 1 Cor. 5:9, the things which he observed on that visit—perhaps only a brief one—were doubtless discussed in that letter, and called for no further treatment in our first epistle. But if now there really *was* such a visit before this lost letter, 1 Cor. 16:7 refers to it, and shows explicitly that it must have been only a flying visit (*ἐν παρόδῳ*). In any case, in order to explain the insinuations referred to in 2 Cor. 10:10, we must suppose that Paul on occasion of a visit to Corinth had had some sad experiences, that at that time he had dealt leniently with them, being reluctant to adopt strenuous measures (probably because he had recently learned by his experience in Galatia how little was effected by a harsh treatment of his churches), and that it was only in a letter written after this visit that he recommended stern measures against certain persons. If these events had happened in the time between our first and second epistles, we should have to suppose that it was the efforts of the Judaizers with which he was concerned, since it was they who at that time were making the apostle the most trouble. What he actually had to deal with, however, according to 2 Cor. 12:21; 13:2, was the sins of sensuality, as was also the case in the letter mentioned in 1 Cor. 5:9; and in this letter we know for certain that he pronounced the severest sentence of church discipline upon the fornicators within the church, as he had previously done upon the pious busybodies at Thessalonica. The visit therefore not only *may* have been, but *must* have been, *before* the lost letter, and with this the whole theory of a visit between our two letters falls to the ground.

The main argument for the hypothesis of a lost letter

between our two epistles has been the remarkable circumstance that, according to 1 Cor. 4:17, Paul sent Timothy to Corinth and that, although he is with him again when Second Corinthians is written (2 Cor. 1:1), not a word is said of any news brought by him; that, on the other hand (2 Cor. 2:12), Paul expects Titus with the report from Corinth concerning the result of his letter, and that he (7:5 ff.) in fact meets him in Macedonia with the news for which he was waiting. Inasmuch as all former attempts to explain these facts were evidently unsuccessful, it seemed as if it would be really necessary to adopt the hypothesis that Paul, on receipt of the news brought by Timothy, sent to Corinth by the hand of Titus another letter which is no longer extant. It is remarkable, however, that just at the time at which, according to 1 Cor., chap. 4, Timothy was despatched to Corinth the Acts of the Apostles (19:22) mentions only a journey to Macedonia. Still more remarkable is it that in 1 Cor. 16:10 Paul speaks of Timothy's coming as a possibility only (*ἐὰν δὲ ἔλθῃ*), although in 4:17 he had spoken of it quite positively. This can be explained only on the supposition that while the apostle was writing the first letter to the Corinthians the doubt arose in his mind whether it was desirable that Timothy should go to Corinth just at that time; accordingly he sent another messenger, perhaps Erastus (Acts 19:22), to overtake Timothy on his way through Macedonia in order to recall him; but that, not knowing whether Erastus would really find him, he expresses great anxiety as to the result in case Timothy should actually get to Corinth—an anxiety of which 4:14-17 shows no trace whatever. Between the departure of Timothy, therefore, which was occasioned by the news received from the household of Chloe concerning the existence of factions in Corinth, and his recall as implied in 16:10 something must have happened which created doubt in the mind of the apostle whether this mission of Timothy could still be successful or whether it was now at all expedient. This must have been the arrival of the delegation from Corinth (1 Cor. 16:17), with the letter from the church (7:1); in consequence of which that which he himself wrote in reference to the news which they brought and in reply to the letter of the

church (constituting the latter part of our First Corinthians), being carried by Titus directly to Corinth, would certainly arrive there in advance of Timothy's arrival. By this letter the commission given to Timothy had manifestly been rendered inopportune; and it would have been very unfortunate if Timothy had come to Corinth without knowing the contents of the letter or what Paul had learned in the meantime from the Corinthian delegation. The message to Timothy bidding him return which was thus made necessary in fact overtook him in Macedonia, and this explains perfectly why we find Timothy with the apostle, and why he was expecting Titus with news concerning the result of his letter, and renders unnecessary the hypothesis of an intermediate letter. It has also been justly said that if Timothy had actually reached Corinth he would certainly have been mentioned along with Titus in 12:18.

It has indeed been maintained that the references in Second Corinthians to a recently written letter do not fit our First Corinthians, and that for this reason we must assume an intermediate letter. But this by no means follows from the animadversions against him to the effect that he was always commending and praising himself, since the way in which he repeatedly appeals in the first epistle to his own example and speaks of his apostolic prerogatives, activities, and success might easily furnish his malicious opponents occasion for their attacks. Indeed, 2 Cor. 1:12 seems to refer directly to 1 Cor. 2:4 f. It must be admitted, however, that the apostle's great distress of mind over the result of his former epistle (2 Cor. 2:13; 7:5), and his expression concerning the state of mind in which he wrote it (2:14), is at first sight somewhat surprising if the reference is to our first epistle. But this is so only in case we concentrate our attention on the calm doctrinal discussions of the first epistle, to which of course these expressions do not refer. It is easy to overlook the cutting severity and the exceeding bitterness of tone which permeates all the polemical portion of the first epistle. Evidently the severity with which he dealt with the case of incest (1 Cor., chap. 5) would be most keenly felt in Corinth, as he himself was aware, and he refers to precisely this

matter in 2:5 f. in connection with what he says in 2:4 about the grief with which he wrote and the love he bore them. But it is surprising how startlingly in 1 Cor. 4:7-15 also the calm discussion is succeeded by an outburst of profound indignation over the empty pride and complacent self-satisfaction of the Corinthians, although severe expressions have already interrupted this discussion in passages like 3:1-4, 16-18; 4:3. And it is easy to conceive that he feared that in other passages also the church would miss the affectionate tone of their spiritual father, and that it was not easy for him to reproach them so severely as in this letter he was compelled repeatedly to do.

But these hypotheses of intermediate letters and intermediate journeys are not only unnecessary but untenable, since the second letter is connected in the closest possible way with the first. When Paul wrote the first letter he intended (16:5, 8) to make a journey through Asia to Macedonia; in the second letter he is carrying out this intention, going by way of Troas (2:8, 12 f.). According to 2 Cor. 1:15 f. the church at Corinth had been offended with him, misinterpreting his action in going directly to Macedonia and not, according to the promise he had made in a previous letter (see 2 Cor. 2:13) to Macedonia by way of Corinth, and then from Macedonia back to Corinth for a second visit. When and where he had made this promise we do not know; probably in the lost letter preceding our first. So much, however, is certain, that when he wrote 1 Cor. 16:5 he had already made this change in his plans, and in that passage informs them of the change. For the seemingly tautological repetition of *διέρχουμαι* (1 Cor. 16:5) has no significance whatever unless he intended by it to emphasize the fact that he was not coming to them as his former promises had given them reason to expect, but was on the point of starting immediately for Macedonia. The only reason he gives for this is that he does not wish at this time to make them a merely passing visit as he had done before. The Corinthians themselves could not but see that after writing this letter it would be impossible for him to come to them without entering into a full discussion of many questions at issue between them. The deeper

reason he could not, of course, state in this letter; but now that the Corinthians had so outrageously misconstrued his change of plan, he is compelled to state it (2 Cor. 1:23; 2:1 ff.). Even in the first letter (1 Cor. 4:18) he had intimated that if he came before they had thoroughly reformed he should be obliged to resort to strenuous measures, and this, for his sake as well as for theirs, he was extremely reluctant to do. It was for this reason that he wrote instead of coming, hoping that the result of his letter would be that he would be able to come to them again with joy and not with sorrow.

If, then, the second letter is so closely connected with the first in subject-matter, intermediate journeys and letters are absolutely excluded. Moreover, the interruption of his discussion of his reasons for going directly to Macedonia instead of to Corinth (2:5-11) is utterly inexplicable unless his object was, in connection with vss. 3 and 4, to point out that he had in fact acted wisely in writing, since as a result of his letter the matter which had caused him most sorrow, and in which he had been compelled to cause them sorrow, was now happily disposed of. In this connection the matter referred to must be something discussed in the first letter. And the repeated expression *ὁ τοιοῦτος* (2:6 f.) refers as if by express intention to 1 Cor. 5:5, just as in 2 Cor. 7:12, where he is also speaking of the good result of their temporary sorrow which he had been obliged to cause them, he refers to the *ἀδικήσας* and the *ἀδικηθεῖς*. Here he must certainly be speaking not of an insult to himself or his messenger, but of the case of incest, and what he says is again closely connected not with any discussion of this matter in a lost letter, but with 1 Cor., chap. 5. In that passage he had said that he would have preferred to deliver such an one unto Satan. But inasmuch as he would not do this unless the church would fully concur with him in this sentence, and the church had shown itself far too lax and indifferent in this unhappy matter, he had contented himself with imperatively demanding the exclusion of the offender from the church. The majority of the church has inflicted this punishment (2 Cor. 2:6), and if now they are willing to pardon the penitent offender, he will not insist upon the minority's concurring

in the sentence, but expressly requests, for reasons that he sets forth, that the offender shall be restored to the church, this evidence of the obedience of the church, as such, being satisfactory to him (2:8 f.). If the explanation of the apparent interruption in 2:5-11 is correct, then it is clear how appropriately 2:12 ff. joins on to 2:4. The figurative expression, 2:14, has often been misunderstood. What it really means is simply that in the particular case mentioned in vss. 5-11 God has once more triumphed over him, inasmuch as by the news which Titus has brought concerning the success of his letter he has proved that all his anxiety had been wholly superfluous. Accordingly he brings the introductory thanksgiving of his letter (1:3-2:16) to a speedy conclusion and with 3:17 passes over to the great apologetic section of the first part of the letter (3:1-6:13). But there is no reason to regard even 6:14-7:1 as an irrelevant interpolation. The chief defects of the church, which were due to too intimate intercourse with their unbelieving countrymen, could not be corrected at one stroke, however good the effect of his letter. Accordingly he begins the hortatory portion with a renewed warning against all fellowship with heathenism; but in order to guard against their again misunderstanding him and supposing that he was overlooking the fact that they had made a good beginning in their reformation, he speaks in chap. 7 at length of the news which Titus had brought, and closes with an expression of the joy and good courage which he again has with reference to the church (7:16). He then passes to the matter of the collection for the saints, about which he has much to say to the church. This interpretation of the course of thought in chap. 7, and the continuity of the admonitions in chaps. 8 and 9, I have set forth at length in my *Erläuterungen*, already referred to. If anyone is surprised that the apostle adopts so different a tone in the third part of the letter (10:1-12:18), this is because it is overlooked that here the apostle is settling accounts with his Judaizing opponents and that he is dealing with the church only in so far as they have allowed these miserable agitators to impose themselves upon them. On the other hand, in the concluding exhortation (12:19-13:10), he turns his

attention again to those individuals who had not yet really repented, warning them not to compel him to use his divinely given authority if he should now come.

There is, accordingly, no more occasion to break up this letter into several pieces, written at different times, than to adopt the hypothesis of lost letters written between our First and Second Corinthians, which necessarily calls in question the genuineness of both letters, inasmuch as they involve the view that as these letters stand they cannot be explained as the product of a clearly defined situation.

#### V. THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

The question concerning the constituent elements of the church at Rome to which Paul wrote may now be considered as finally settled by the history of modern criticism. Baur, feeling himself compelled in the interest of his conception of the letter to maintain the Jewish-Christian character of the church, endeavored to disprove the traditional view that it was composed essentially of Gentile Christians. His view was shared by many, even outside of his school, as for instance by Mangold, who attempted to elaborate this view in a special treatise (1866). In 1876 Holtzmann was able to assert with a certain semblance of truth that, as a result of modern investigation, the traditional view had been abandoned. But that very same year Weizsäcker protested in the *Jahrbuch für deutsche Theologie* against the modern view, and proved with the old arguments how indisputable the fact was that Paul conceived of his readers as Gentile Christians. From that time the tide began to move in the opposite direction; in vain did Mangold attempt once more in an entirely revised edition of his book (1884) to defend the thesis of Baur. Strangely enough there is an inclination, especially in the school of Hofmann, to take up that view again. But, as in the case of Baur, this is merely the result of a special tendency, although a tendency in quite another direction. How complete a victory the traditional view has gained, issuing from the prolonged conflict freshly established, is manifest from the embarrassment of Holtzmann in attempting to escape from the

difficulty by asserting that Paul himself would not have been able to answer satisfactorily the question concerning the proportions of the constituent elements of the church at Rome. That is not the question at all. For Paul must have known whether he conceived of the readers to whom he wrote as Jewish or as Gentile Christians.

Steck is wholly in error when, in order to show that the epistle to the Romans is also a patchwork made up from different treatises of the Pauline school, he asserts that at least the portion from 1:16—8:39 presupposes that the minds of the readers are still in bondage to Jewish Christianity. Even in 3:27–30 Paul argues from premises which would be unhesitatingly accepted only by Pauline Gentile Christians; in 4:16 he includes the readers with himself and his people in the πάντων ἡμῶν in order to imply that Abraham was the father both of Jewish and Gentile Christians. Since the type of doctrine which the readers have been divinely led to accept (6:16, 17) is shown by the connection to be that which is characterized in vs. 14 f. by the words οὐχ ὑπὸ νόμον ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ χάριν εἶναι, and since their past is also expressly characterized (vs. 19) by subjection to ἀκαθαρσία καὶ ἀνομία, it is evident that these readers are Pauline Gentile Christians. Beyschlag, to be sure, still claims on the ground of 7:1–6 that the church was composed of those who had been Jewish proselytes. But the anarthrous use of the word “law” and the whole connection show that the readers in 7:1 are not designated as persons acquainted with “*the law*” (though even Gentile Christians had become acquainted with it, according to Gal. 4:21, through the reading of the Old Testament in the meetings of the congregation), but as knowing *law*. It was, as also the epistle to the Galatians shows, just as important to prove that the Gentile Christians were free from law as such as that the Jewish Christians were so; since the Gentiles in becoming converted to the God of Israel would evidently be subject to his law *if* the obligation to render such obedience had not been removed for the Jews as well as for the Gentiles. The passage 7:5 f., however, does not by any means show that the readers have been subject with the apostle to the

law, but only means that both are, by their common deliverance from the law, free from its power to stir up in them the old sinful passions again and again.

But Steck is right in saying that no one has as yet sufficiently explained what purpose the doctrinal expositions of the epistle to the Romans have as addressed to Gentile Christians. Just because he considered them as polemical, directed against Judaizing tendencies, Baur was compelled to consider the readers as Jewish Christians. No matter how much the opposition which Paul has in view is reduced, whether one looks for it with Mangold among the Jewish Christians or with the majority of critics among the Roman Gentile Christians, who are supposed not to have reached as yet the height of Pauline knowledge, the idea that he is conducting a polemic against the views held by them, or is seeking to rectify their views, is in manifest contradiction to the full approval of their spiritual condition (1:12), which would become thereby an insincere *captatio benevolentiae*, and with the definite implication in 15:14 f. that they share his knowledge and need only to be reminded of it. Every view which holds that the purpose of the letter is to reconcile opposing elements in the church, as is maintained by the later Tübingen school, men like Volkmar, Holsten, and Pfeiderer, is disproved by the fact that the Jewish Christians can have formed only a very small percentage of the church, and that at the only point where this opposition becomes conspicuous in the church (15:8 f.) the matter is a practical controversy over a very specific matter the treatment of which in chapter 14 excludes any far-reaching doctrinal difference. On the other side, in opposition to the very plausible view concerning the epistle defended recently by Weizsäcker, Grafe, and Jülicher, according to which the epistle aims to protect the church against invading Judaism, Steck has shown that, except in 3:8, there is in the whole epistle not a trace of an anti-Judaistic polemic, such as appears, for example, in the second epistle to the Corinthians. He might have added that Weizsäcker himself admits that we do not know that this reproach (Rom. 3:8) was ever brought against Paul by the Judaizers. It must be conceded, therefore,

that the polemical statements of the epistle cannot be explained by any immediate exigencies of the church at Rome. This is fully confirmed if we do not look at these statements from the point of view of a preconceived opinion concerning the purpose of the epistle, but ask ourselves the question whether they really can be regarded as attacks upon Judaistic errors in any form.

None of the theories concerning the purpose of the epistle to the Romans thus far proposed has succeeded in showing how the exposition of the punitive judgment of God upon the heathen world in chap. 1 stands related to the purpose which these theories attribute to the apostle. When, however, Paul in 2: 1—3: 20 sets forth that the Jews are also subject to this judgment of wrath in spite of their possessing the law and being circumcised, since the opportunity which they by their unfaithfulness furnished to God to exhibit his faithfulness in a yet clearer light cannot secure impunity for them; and, further, that the Old Testament teaching concerning universal sinfulness has reference to them also; it is clear that this portion of the letter cannot be directed against the Jewish-Christian position, since no Jewish Christian ever denied that the Jews, if they do not fulfill the law of which they boast and if their circumcision is not accompanied by that of the heart, are likewise subject to the judgment of God. And yet it is precisely in this part of the epistle that the apostle's dialectical method is most marked—a method which conveys the impression that he is establishing his position first of all in the controversy with the Jews. Without a trace of polemic the apostle proceeds then to show in 3: 21—4: 25 that it is only the gospel of justification by faith that can satisfy the religious needs of man, inasmuch as it excludes all self-righteousness and is equally available for both Jews and Gentiles; and, further, that this justification by faith had in both these respects a prototype in the history of Abraham. When he proves, however, in chap. 5 in a doctrinal and historical exposition that with this righteousness was given also life, *i. e.*, the completion of salvation, he has just arrived at the point on which he differed most sharply with the Judaizers; still there is no reference to their conception that the promises given to the

people of Israel could be shared only by those who have become incorporated with them by submitting to the law and circumcision.

The following section (6:1 ff.) might perhaps under stress be interpreted as an attempt on Paul's part to guard against the reproach that his doctrine of justification by faith would lead men to continue in sin. But in that case the paragraph is introduced in a very unskillful way by the harshest expression of the power of the law to increase sin (5:20, 21). The proof, however, in chap. 6, that in baptism a new life had already been established, which would necessarily lead to freedom from sin and to the service of righteousness, develops in a purely theoretical manner the consequences of the apostle's doctrine of grace. Even such a practical application as occurs in 6:12 ff. is not intended to correct Judaistic misconceptions, but is rather a moral exhortation addressed to the Gentile Christians. Finally, the exposition concerning the deliverance of the Christian from the law, in chap. 7, does not follow the mode of argument employed by the epistle to the Galatians, in which the apostle demonstrably deals with Judaistic opponents, but is based upon his own experience under the law from which he has learned that the law cannot overcome, but only stimulate, sin; thus it is proved that a new principle is absolutely necessary for the conquest of the power of sin in man. That the spirit given to us through our vital communion with Christ is this principle is clearly stated in chap. 8, but immediately the apostle turns to the exhortation that the Christians should surrender themselves to this spirit in all the affairs of life, and should find in it the pledge of the completion of salvation, the certainty of which he sees, finally, in the election and calling of those who have been justified.

It is an old opinion that Paul speaks of his mission to the Gentiles in chaps. 9-11, and justifies it over against Judaizing prejudices. The problem which occupies him here is, however, merely the question which, because of his affection for his nation—here again so vividly and repeatedly expressed, *e. g.*, 9:1-5 and 10:1—moves him deeply: What is the reason that notwithstanding the promises made in the first instance to Israel the majority of

the people of Israel have not obtained the salvation which was promised to them primarily? For no Jewish Christian ever considered it an injustice that God chose Isaac rather than Ishmael, and Jacob rather than Esau, or that he hardened Pharaoh; and still here also in the treatment of the subject Paul's peculiar dialectic method appears most vividly. If Paul emphasizes strongly the absolute freedom of God, which is displayed in ruling over the creatures of his power, he certainly has in mind first of all the expressions of unbelieving Jews; but over against this he at once states in 9:22 ff. the real condition of things, according to which God has endured the vessels which have become subject to his wrath with great patience, and has put off his final judgment in order to make room for the calling of the Gentiles, promised already in the Old Testament. He proceeds to show that the unbelieving Jews have themselves brought this fate upon themselves, by committing the unpardonable sin of unbelief which determines their fate (9:30—10:21). Did a Jewish Christian ever doubt this? If, consequently, the majority of Israel is hardened at present and only a remnant is saved, as even the prophets had foreseen (11:1—10), Paul has nevertheless come back to the belief that in the wonderful grace of God all Israel may finally be saved as a nation (11:25—36). And when he inserts here a practical application, it is not one intended to refute some Jewish-Christian error, but to warn the Gentile Christians not to boast, but rather to endeavor, by continuing in the grace of God through faith, to escape being themselves cast away. How little, however, these digressions of the epistle are intended to meet special needs of the church at Rome may be seen also from the hortatory part in which Paul develops the whole series of Christian duties in an entirely theoretical fashion, and only in chap. 14 takes up a special matter concerning which there had been some controversy in Rome.

It is, indeed, asserted that the epistle to the Romans could not be explained historically, and that it would be without any analogy whatsoever among the Pauline epistles, if it were not occasioned by existing defects and errors of the church at Rome. But on any theory this epistle holds a unique position

among the Pauline letters and the historical occasion may very well have been in the personal experiences of the apostle. We must remember that Paul stood at an important turning point of his life, since, having finished his work in the Orient, he was now looking for a new field of activity in the Occident. Just after the victorious completion of the controversy with his Judaistic opponents in Galatia and Corinth, it must have been a necessity for the apostle, having now learned to appreciate better what was defensible in the position of his opponents, to sum up the whole matter. And this he did, following his natural impulse as a writer, and formulating in a comprehensive treatise his doctrine of salvation, setting forth its points of agreement with the revelation of God in the Old Testament and with the claims which the children of Israel have, owing to their peculiar position in the history of the kingdom of God. The reason why he did this in the form of an epistle to the church at Rome was partly that this was about the only form in which he was accustomed to exercise his ability as a writer, and partly that just at this time he had occasion to announce to *this* church his intention to visit them.

He had long ago recognized the importance of the church in the world's capital (1:8), and it must have been a matter of importance to him to induce this church to receive and transmit a conception of his message of salvation adapted to end forever the controversy between Jewish and Gentile Christians, and which he was just then engaged in allaying by his journey to the mother church at Jerusalem for the purpose of delivering a collection from the churches. If he had in view with this matter an immediately practical purpose it could only be this, to enable the church at Rome, where Christianity and Judaism were both seeking to win for themselves the Gentile already yearning after monotheism, to answer all the claims and meet all the objections of Judaism. Let us remember, however, that he was just at that time seriously threatened by hostile Jews (15:31), and we shall at once see that the thought must have come to him that this epistle might be his legacy to the church and through it to all Christendom.

Baur's rejection of chapters 15 and 16 as not genuine was perfectly comprehensible from his point of view, since this section too directly contradicted his views concerning the anti-Judaism of Paul (*cf.* 15 : 8), the Jewish-Christian character of the church at Rome (*cf.* 15 : 14 ff.) and the unhistorical character of the Acts in those passages which tell of the first activity of Paul in Jerusalem (*cf.* 15 : 9). That Marcion, who also of necessity objected strongly to 15 : 8, did not have this section in his *Apostolos* does not concern us here, if we remember how he adapted the epistles to the necessities of his theory; and Baur's other reasons for rejecting the section were artificial and far fetched. Even writers as early as Lucht and Volkmar attempted, therefore, to extract from these two chapters the genuine conclusion which had been worked over later with an irenical tendency because it sounded too harsh; while genuine Tübingenists, like Hilgenfeld and Pfleiderer, and with them the majority of the other more recent critics, continued to defend their genuineness in spite of Baur. Since Mangold's refutation, which, with indefatigable industry, follows criticism into all its detailed objections, this position of Baur may also be regarded as superseded. Only the spuriousness of the doxology (16 : 25-27) has been maintained by many defenders of the remainder of the two chapters. The only reason that can be given for this view with any semblance of truth is that in some manuscripts the doxology is found at the end of chap. 14, in others is in both places, and in still others is missing entirely. But this fact is most probably the result of the omission of the concluding chapters in Marcion. If one does not consider this omission of any importance, the reason for the spuriousness of the closing doxology is removed also; if one, however, maintains this reason it is necessary in consistency to return to the position, now fortunately superseded, of doubting the genuineness of both of the concluding chapters. For the internal evidence against the genuineness of the closing doxology is at best weak. It is usually, with Holtzmann, attributed to the *auctor ad Ephesios*. Those who regard the apostle as the author of the epistle to the Ephesians can consequently make no objection to it here.

An entirely different question which has nothing to do with the genuineness of the Pauline epistles is whether the section 16: 1–20 was originally a part of the epistle to the Romans or whether it was an independent letter of recommendation for the deaconess Phoebe to the church at Ephesus. Even among the critics the controversy concerning this point is still going on. I believe that in almost every verse there are such overwhelming reasons in favor of the latter view that I cannot quite understand how anyone can adhere to the traditional view. The process by which this letter of recommendation got into the epistle to the Romans is, indeed, easily enough explained. If the deaconess went to Ephesus in order to embark thence for Rome and to deliver our epistle, it was but natural that the church at Ephesus should make a copy of this epistle and preserve with it the lines of recommendation which the church had received through the same hand that brought the precious epistle. It is easy to suppose that later on, since this *ἐπιστολὴ συστατικὴ* had no address of its own, these lines were embodied in the epistle to the Romans, with which they had been connected from the beginning.

#### VI. THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.

With the epistle to the Colossians we pass to the so-called epistles of the captivity. Whether this was written from Rome or from Cæsarea does not affect the question of genuineness—I myself believe that the weight of evidence is for Cæsarea. But with the question concerning the errorists whom Paul opposes in the letter the case is different; the conception we form of these will determine our answer to the question whether the letter is genuine or not. And in reference to this matter the assumption that those whose error is refuted are partly or wholly the same as those against whom the epistle to the Galatians is directed has not yet received as thorough a refutation as the case demands. What the apostle is here dealing with is evidently not a denial of his doctrine of salvation, but rather the question whether for the attainment of the true consummation of Christian life and character, and so for the

full assurance of salvation, something more and greater be not necessary than the simple belief of that message of salvation and the Christian morality that comes with it, viz., a profound insight into the secrets of the divine being and a strict regulation of the whole life by ascetic rules.

This insight, it was supposed, could be attained partly through traditional theosophic doctrines (2:8), partly through visions and dreams (2:18); and asceticism was deemed necessary in order to enable one to enter into intercourse with the heavenly world, by which it would become more and more thoroughly known. Inasmuch as the asceticism in the Roman church, with which Romans (chap. 14) deals, and which included abstinence from flesh and wine as well as a strict observance of certain fast days, is to be traced to Essenic influence, it is probable that this theosophic-ascetic tendency of Jewish Christianity is also connected with Essenism.

It appears, to be sure, from 2:11 and 3:11 that this Jewish-Christian party attached great value to circumcision; this, however, was not because, like the Pharisaic party in the church, they held that by it one was incorporated into the Israelitish community, to which alone belonged the attainment of salvation, but because through it the whole physical life was believed to be in a higher degree consecrated to God. The Jewish festivals likewise (2:16) were not observed because the Mosaic law was regarded as of permanent validity, but because by such consecration to God of certain regularly recurring days the whole daily life was supposed to gain a higher consecration. Moreover, the rules which were, in the stricter sense, ascetic had, according to 2:20 ff., no relation whatever to the Old Testament, but were based upon commandments of men regarding all physical enjoyments; and for this reason Paul never appeals in his polemic to the Old Testament. Nevertheless the apostle perceived clearly that the danger from this party was quite as great as that from Pharisaic Jewish Christianity; for, aside from the conceit which such new wisdom and philosophy produced, it inevitably led to the idea that the fullness of the divine essence was poured out over the entire higher world of

spirits and thereupon to the attempt by worship of angels (2: 18 and 23) to enter into mysterious relation with the Godhead; which the apostle foresaw would imperil both the unique majesty and dignity of Christ and the all-sufficiency of his redeeming work and mediatorship. These ascetic exercises, moreover, tended continually to the development of a new legalism which Paul could not but regard as a return to an obsolete stage of religious development (2: 20).

Nevertheless the apostle was obliged to assume toward this tendency a very different attitude from that which he had taken toward the Pharisaic party in the church. Inasmuch as they did not oppose his doctrine of salvation, he could not reject their doctrine *in toto*; there was a legitimate element in it, inasmuch as it met an awakening consciousness of need of deeper knowledge. He himself knew that the gospel concealed in itself a profound divine wisdom (*cf.* 1 Cor., chap. 2) which was able fully to satisfy this desire; and the comparative restraint and greater leisure of his imprisonment gave him abundant opportunity to penetrate more and more into this divine wisdom. In his earlier letters the godlike glory of the exalted Christ had led to the recognition of his eternal existence and activity; all that was lacking now was that he should be apprehended as the foundation and the goal of all creation, all orders of the heavenly beings included (*cf.* 1: 16), and that it should be seen that in him all the fullness of the Godhead, of which this theosophy had so much to say, dwelt bodily. His redemptive work also appeared now in an entirely new light. Hitherto Paul had regarded it only from the point of view of the human need of salvation; now, however, he perceived how by it the victory was gained over the principalities and powers hostile to God (2: 15) and how the kingly dominion of Christ had displaced them, so that his redemptive work acquired also a cosmic significance. In proportion as the increasing tendency to speculation threatened to divide the church into parties or schools, Paul was compelled to emphasize the organic unity of the church under Christ as its head (1: 18 and 24; 2: 19) and the universal significance of the gospel by which it had been founded (1: 6, 23). To be sure he was

obliged continually to insist that the content of the gospel was not some theosophic speculation but the mystery of salvation; yet at the same time that in the gospel were hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge (2:2 f.). Now, therefore, the difference between heathenism and Judaism is obliterated (3:10 f.) in an entirely different way from that employed in the earlier letters; by the redemptive death of Christ the law itself, conceived of as a code of statutes, is as such abrogated, and not simply the obligation of the individual to obey it. Now also the destiny of the world appears in a new light; the great gulf which sin made in the divinely created world of spirits is done away, and by joining them to Christ as their only head, men *and* angels must again be united (1:20). Thus in a certain sense the antithesis between heaven and earth is even in this life done away with.

But lofty as were these chronological, soteriological, and eschatological speculations, yet the apostle was constantly forced to emphasize the fact that every true advance in knowledge must also bear fruit in the fulfillment of the divine will and in the achievement of complete moral renewal (1:9 f.; 2:9 ff.). He was, however, compelled also to prove how this renewal is shown not in the carrying out of arbitrary human enactments, but in the reorganization of domestic and social life with the duties pertaining to it. In a more thoroughgoing way than in the earlier letters he sought to regulate the Christian moral life through detailed prescriptions, and the significance of the Old Testament was revealed to him in a new light, being regarded no longer as a code, but as a typical foreshadowing of the divine will as it was fulfilled in Christ (2:11, 17). It is the province of biblical theology to set forth in detail this development of Paulinism in all directions as it appears in the letters of the imprisonment (*cf.* my *Lehrbuch der biblischen Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, 6. Aufl., Berlin, 1895). It is sufficient for criticism to prove that there was adequate occasion for this development in the new kind of opposition which confronted the apostle in Colossæ.

To be sure if we deny to the Paul of the great doctrinal and

controversial epistles any capacity of development in his ideas we can hardly regard the epistle to the Colossians as his work; and if we hold that he was limited to a narrow vocabulary and a stereotyped style, forced upon him by the former controversial period, we can no longer recognize the apostle in the writer of these letters. But what a pitiful conception of the great apostle underlies criticism of this sort. It is, on the contrary, only natural that his rigid and dogmatic style of expression with its theses and antitheses should disappear upon the cessation of the conflict with Pharisaic Judaism; and that when there was no longer any opposition to his doctrine of salvation the argumentative exposition of it should likewise cease. Moreover, as a wise teacher Paul would take up the technical terms of the theosophists, such as *πλήρωμα* and *μυστήριον*, as well as their speculations concerning the angelic orders, their demand for a higher gnosis, and for the perfection of the Christian life; only he would stamp them with a meaning of his own. He was obliged to employ in the unfolding of the entire fullness and depth of the truth of salvation a mode of presentation different from that required in the original exposition and substantiation of it. The long-drawn-out sentences, overloaded with ideas, their parts only loosely connected by relatives and participial constructions, simply show that the same apostle is writing who in the earlier letters shows himself unacquainted with literary Greek and on principle indifferent to rhetorical effect. Where, however, he assumes again a definite polemical attitude he expresses himself in antitheses which are as pointed as in the earlier letters, though now they often suggest more than is actually said.

In view of all this it is easy to understand how criticism should inevitably have been in perplexity concerning the genuineness of this letter. Ewald, indeed, for a time went no further than to ascribe it to Timothy, who drew it up after a preliminary discussion of its contents with the apostle. But the Tübingen school was forced to construe the expressions of the letter in the sense of second-century gnosticism in order thus to be able to prove by an evident *circulus in demonstrando* that it was influenced by this gnosticism and opposed it; or to discover in the

mention of the Petrine Mark (4:10) and the Pauline Luke (4:14) a trace of the reconciling tendency of the second century which was supposed to appear also in the emphasis which the epistle lays on the unity of the church. Hilgenfeld, however, dated the letter much earlier and regarded it as a polemic against the beginnings of gnosticism in the person of Cerinthus. In this he returned to the view of Mayerhoff, who first (1838) controverted the genuineness of the letter from this point of view. But it is most interesting to observe that the alleged dependence of the letter to the Colossians upon that to the Ephesians, on which he based his attack, was just the point at which the reactionary movement set in. When Holtzmann in 1872 carefully investigated both letters with reference to this point, he believed that he found interwoven in Colossians the indications both of originality and dependence upon Ephesians, both of genuineness and of spuriousness. Upon this he built the hypothesis that the genuine letter of Paul to the Colossians was imitated by the *auctor ad Ephesios* and then once more—with what purpose it is difficult to conceive—was interpolated to suit his own views. In opposition to him von Soden in 1885 successfully proved that the indications of dependence and spuriousness found by Holtzmann in the letter to the Colossians were wholly unsubstantiated, and he regarded only a very few verses as later interpolations. In his *Hand-Commentar*, 1891, he admitted the genuineness even of these. Since then Jülicher and Harnack have emphatically declared themselves in favor of the genuineness of the epistle as handed down by tradition. Accordingly this letter also, having been tested by the fire of criticism, has maintained its genuineness.

It is certain that since the personal greetings in chap. 4 are not matters of invention they constitute an argument against the hypothesis of pseudonymous authorship difficult to overcome. The same is true of the canonical letter to Philemon, so inseparably joined to the Colossian letter by the reference in Col. 4:9. It is today quite generally accepted that Baur's maintenance of the spuriousness of this letter was one of his worst blunders. That he should have called it the embryo of a Christian novel

sounds like a jest, not a scientific argument. Weizsäcker is nearer right in regarding it as the presentation of truth by example. But in that case we should expect a discussion of the question of slavery. Unfortunately, however, the letter gives no definite instructions on the subject whether Philemon is to receive the returning slave as a brother merely, or free him, or give him to the apostle as his personal servant; that is purposely left undetermined in the letter. That Hilgenfeld, in spite of Baur, accepts the letter as genuine is an admirable evidence of his appreciation of the character of this document with its delicate tact and spirit of amiable comradeship testifying in every word to its genuineness. But this conclusion of his is not consistent. It would be a refinement of deception, entirely foreign to pseudonymous literature of that period, that an author who purposed writing to the Colossians in the name of Paul should ferret out this private letter in order to accredit himself as the genuine Paul by the allusion to it in 4:9.

#### VII. THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

When Schleiermacher and DeWette directed their criticism against the letter to the Ephesians, their chief argument was that the general content of the letter stood in evident contradiction with the special address. This argument has been abandoned since modern textual criticism has conclusively shown that the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ in the address are a later addition. Indeed, doubt of this fact, though entertained by even so distinguished a commentator as Meyer, must be definitely given up; as well as the view, represented by Bleek, that the address, so clearly incomplete, was left so by Paul himself in order to issue several copies of it, filling in local references in each case. Why the apostle designates his readers as "saints who also believe in Jesus Christ," that is, New Testament saints in contradistinction to those of the Old Testament, cannot be understood at all if the proper purpose of the letter receives so little consideration as is ordinarily the case. Likewise, the identification of the letter in any way with that mentioned in Col. 4:16 must be definitely given up. It is excluded by the fact that Paul in 4:15 could not send

greetings to the Laodiceans in the letter to the Colossians, if, at the same time, he sent to Laodicea by the same messenger one addressed to them, or even intended also for them. We must, however, abandon all attempt to justify the special address on the ground that the letter, at least in the first instance, was intended for Ephesus; because in that case we do not at all meet the real difficulties which criticism has from the first rightly pointed out. Since the readers are addressed constantly as Gentile Christians, but according to 3:2 ff.; 4:21 could not possibly have been converted by Paul, it follows that this circular letter was addressed to Gentile-Christian churches not founded by the apostle, to whom it was to be carried and read publicly. Tychicus, the bearer of the letter (6:21), must have received verbal instructions to that effect. That the churches addressed were in Asia Minor is made highly probable simply by the fact that Tychicus carried the circular letter at the same time that he went to Asia Minor with the Colossian letter. The simplest explanation of the later insertion of the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ is that the letter intended for the churches of Asia Minor in general was at a later time assumed to have been addressed primarily to the metropolis, Ephesus.

The second difficulty which the letter presents is its extremely close relationship with the letter to the Colossians. And this difficulty is not so easily disposed of as is generally thought. If, to be sure, we recall the parallel passages in the two letters to the Thessalonians and the parallels in the letters to the Romans and the Galatians, the latter two written years apart, we cannot wonder that two letters written practically at the same time show so great similarity both in form and matter. This becomes, however, perfectly explicable only when we suppose that the news received from Colossæ had introduced Paul into an entirely new circle of ideas, and that as a natural result, though writing a circular letter to a group of churches, he was still dominated by the thoughts developed in the letter to the Colossians. How difficult it is to prove here a strict literary dependence of one letter upon the other appears from the fact that, although the letter to the Ephesians is generally admitted

to be dependent on Colossians, yet Mayerhoff held exactly the opposite opinion, and a keen critic like Holtzmann maintains that the evidence points to mutual dependence. The decisive argument against this view will always be that it would have been impossible for a writer who, when writing independently, could imitate, often so strikingly, the doctrine and style of Paul as the writer of Ephesians must have done, should, in order to make his writings seem like Paul's, follow a Pauline letter in other passages so slavishly, and that even in sections which have nothing whatever to do with the main purpose of his letter. But it is still more incomprehensible that by the fiction of 6:21 f. he should give the first indication of his motive for connecting his composition so closely with a letter which, after all, furnished him for his main purpose a very unsatisfactory point of attachment, especially as such attachment and the fiction would be more likely to give offense than to lend the appearance of genuineness to his composition.

The standing problem for those who maintain the genuineness of both letters is to present proof that as regards the parallel passages the same thoughts and expressions are used with far too great freedom to permit us to speak of literary dependence. In respect to that, however, much remains to be done, since the exegesis of both letters is far from having attained to the exactness and certainty which has been reached in the case of many other letters of Paul. Above all it must be clearly understood that the Pauline spirit was far too rich and free not to be able to express the same thoughts in different ways or to give a different application to the same expressions, even in two letters written the one immediately after the other. So the letter to the Ephesians in spite of its relationship to the Colossian letter exhibits, in accordance with its more general purpose, a peculiar style, or, more exactly, a peculiar coloring of the whole mode of presentation. It contains expressions like the frequently recurring *τὰ ἐπουράνια* and *μεθοδεία* which is found at least twice (4:14; 6:11); so also *διάβολος*, meaning "devil" (4:27; 6:11), which is wholly foreign both to the Colossian letter and the other letters. Such facts are not without importance to one

to whom the close relationship of two contemporaneous letters presents in itself no difficulty. It is certainly a sign of greater freedom from prejudice on the part of criticism that Jülicher and Harnack are again inclined to accept the genuineness of the letter which in spite of its peculiarities preserves in so many ways the undeniable Pauline type. But there will still be need, in that case, of making a somewhat more thorough exegetical investigation of many points. I will not speak of the fact that the interpretation of 2:20 in its relation to 1 Cor. 3:9 f. is still unsettled, since it can be said that the varying application of such a figure is not of itself remarkable, even though in this case the underlying thought is of too fundamental a character to be irrelevant to the question of the Pauline origin. Yet upon first glance it is somewhat remarkable that the apostles and prophets are called *ἄγιοι* (3:5), if we do not observe that this explains why they, being sent forth of God to his service, can be set over against the sons of men. And it is certain that 4:11 according to its usual interpretation carries us down beyond the date of the pastoral letters, since here already the government of the church and its instruction appear to be united in the same church officer, the first impulses toward which appear in the pastoral letters. This interpretation, however, cannot be correct, because the whole context clearly shows that only gifts of speech are meant. Accordingly the intention of the addition *καὶ διδάσκαλοι* must be to designate the *ποιμένες* as those shepherds who lead the individual churches to the right pasture (*cf.* John 10:9 f.), that is, provide them with the instruction and admonition which they constantly require.

The Tübingen school, to be sure, advanced nothing that strengthened the argument against the genuineness of the letter. For its contention that here we recognize already the spirit of the second century loses its force, since we find in the letter elements both gnostic and Montanistic, even the same passage (4:7-11) being interpreted by some as gnostic, by others as Montanistic. But it is an altogether baseless claim that here a unification is sought after by means of an external synthesis of faith and love, by weakening the Pauline doctrine of justifica-

tion by faith, and making 'concessions to the Judaistic doctrine of justification by works. Whatever distinguishes the doctrine of this letter from that of the earlier letters is found also in Colossians, and is inseparably connected with the transformation of Paulinism, which in that letter is set forth and explained. When recent criticism, at least in the case of the majority of its representatives, carries the composition of the letter back into the first century, assuming, however, that a disciple of the apostle might have been its author, it surrenders therewith all definite standards by which one can decide whether this transformation could not have taken place in the time of Paul and in his own person. But that which offers some ground for both the older and the later opinion is the fact that its exact aim on the presupposition of the genuineness of the letter has not yet been made clear. There is in the letter no trace of heretics, about whom so much has been said, for 4:14 is satisfactorily interpreted in view of the recent experiences of Paul in the Phrygian churches, and 5:16 does not refer to a libertine gnosis, but to moral seduction. Since now the hortatory portion of the letter begins with most impressive and explicit emphasis upon the unity of the church, both earlier critics like De Wette and recent ones like von Soden have found in this thought the main object of the letter. But this is to enter again the channel of Tübingen criticism which explains the letter from the presupposition that efforts after union of the parties in the church were made in the second century. To be sure it is not difficult to prove that nowhere in our letter is it possible to find a trace of the concessions which are required by this hypothesis, since a demand for the moral preservation of Christian character is found in all the Pauline letters and is no concession to the Judaistic doctrine of righteousness by works. Still, neither has criticism of the other school as yet explained what was the occasion of this exhortation to church unity.

Nor, to be sure, has it been recognized that in the entire first part of the letter this exhortation has been prepared for with conscious purpose. If even the address indicates that the Gentile-Christian readers were saints, as were the members of the

Old Testament covenant nation, the conclusion of the words of thanksgiving in the introduction likewise emphasizes how the Gentile Christians, though in a different way, had attained to the same certainty of the promised salvation as had the Jewish Christians (1:13 f.; *cf.* vs. 12). The entire second chapter turns upon the thought that the Gentile Christians had been actually received into the community of the saints in Israel, after the law was abolished as a method of salvation and life; and the third chapter also begins with the statement that the apostle was entrusted with the gospel, by means of which the Gentiles became actually partakers in the promise to Israel (3:6), a thing which, according to Galatians, chap. 2, even the primitive apostles also recognized. Whereupon it may be reasonably asked what could be the occasion of these declarations and the exhortations of the second part based upon them if the churches of Asia Minor to which the letter was directed were, as on the usual presupposition that Paul is responsible directly and indirectly for the Christianization of the whole of Asia Minor they must have been, altogether made up of Gentile Christians. In the discussion of the Galatian letter we have already seen that this presupposition is untenable. Our judgment, moreover, is evidently established on a broader basis by the Apocalypse. The church at Smyrna which is persecuted only by the synagogue of Satan, which blasphemes the name of Christ, and the church of Philadelphia which had successfully prosecuted its work among the Jews and will continue in it (Rev. 3:8 f.) can only have been purely Jewish-Christian churches. It is clear, therefore, that there were in Asia Minor not only Gentile-Christian churches—many of them, indeed, *e. g.*, those in Phrygia, shown by our letter not to have been founded by Paul—but also from earliest times numerous Jewish-Christian churches which probably owed their origin to the primitive apostles; and this being so, the old conflict between the two might here, as was the case in Galatia, break out again and again, though the opposition would not necessarily take the form of Pharisaic legalism, as it had done in Galatia, but might assume that of theosophic asceticism such as the apostle had so recently met

in Phrygia. And in view of this we can understand how the apostle should feel constrained earnestly to admonish the Gentile-Christian churches of proconsular Asia that by their reception into the community of the saints and by their participation in the promises once made to Israel, itself now free from the obligation of the law, the old antithesis between Jew and Gentile was once for all abolished.

From this point of view, all the admonitions of this letter, growing out of the one chief admonition to maintain the unity of the church, are seen in a new light. For they all turn on the fact that Christianity necessarily carries with it the complete putting off of the old man and the putting on of the new, the description of which issues in the exhortation to walk in love after the example of Christ (4:1 f.; 5:2), and on the warning against all alliance with the old heathen iniquity, even in the form of apparently innocent association with their unbelieving countrymen (5:3-20), the perils of which Paul had formerly learned by severe experiences at Corinth. But after his latest experiences he was compelled to add that asceticism was as unnecessary for this regulation of the whole life in a Christian spirit as was legalism (5:21-6:9). From this there follows yet another consequence. The remarkable literary resemblances between the Ephesian letter and the first epistle of Peter have indeed seemed to almost all recent critics explicable only on the hypothesis that the former, being dependent on the latter, was, though attributed to Paul, spurious. On my view of the epistle of Peter, according to which it is older than Galatians, and was known to Paul when he wrote his letter to the Romans, it is not impossible that the epistle to the Ephesians was written with some reference to it. And even if a spokesman of this school of criticism like Holtzmann calls it "sheer nonsense," it nevertheless remains true that it accords entirely with the aim of this letter that Paul should, with deliberate purpose and openly, employ the language of an older apostolic letter already in circulation in Asia Minor and held in high esteem. He wished to show the Jewish Christians, who would learn of a letter of the great apostle of the Gentiles which was in circulation in that

region just as Paul and the Gentile Christians would hear of the letter of Peter, that the Gentiles were educated in the same Christian truth and manner of life as they themselves. Only on this view can the obstacle on which the genuineness of the letter seems likely after all to be shattered be really removed.

#### VIII. THE EPISTLE TO THE PHILIPPIANS.

Concerning the epistle to the Philippians it may apparently be said at the outset that criticism has only served to establish anew its genuineness. Denial of its genuineness begins with Baur, who rejected it along with the other epistles of the imprisonment. But in order to find echoes of gnosticism in it he was obliged to explain 2:6 from the history of the Valentinian Sophia, and in order to assign it to its place in the conciliation movements of the second century he had to identify the Clement mentioned in 4:3 with the disciple of Peter who appears in the Clementine legend, and whom he regards as one of the *οἱ ἐκ τῆς Καίσαρος οἰκίας* (4:22).

Baur's pupils even interpreted 4:2 as referring not literally to two women, but to two parties which, in the guise of an appeal to his *σύνεργος*, *i. e.*, in their opinion, Peter, Paul admonishes to be of the same mind (4:2, 3). With remarkable unanimity all the leaders of the more recent criticism have decisively rejected this opinion of Baur and his followers, and even Hilgenfeld has recognized that the epistle is genuine. In fact there are few cases in which the impossibility of so much as conceiving of a letter as the work of a pseudonymous tendency-writer is so evident as here. And yet in the *Jahrbücher für protest. Theologie* for 1875-6 Holsten undertook to recover the position which had apparently been lost. But at what cost! According to his view the epistle is no longer to be regarded as a product of the second century, but as having arisen between 70 and 80 A. D., being written, in order, by a continuation of the conciliatory policy which the apostle inaugurated in his epistle to the Romans, to restore the inner unity of the Philippian church. The personal references of the letter are all supposed to rest upon genuine tradition; and only a slight un-Pauline tinge is to

be discovered in doctrine, in language, and in the appreciation of the gift which ostensibly furnishes the occasion for the letter. But even such a critic as Paul Schmidt repudiated this position (in 1880) as "New Testament hypercriticism." And really, that at a time when everybody in Philippi knew that the apostle was dead, and had never written a letter to the church, a disciple of the apostle should fabricate a letter from him to the church, in which the apostle expresses the confident expectation of seeing them again (1:25; 2:24), is a theory which would not have the faintest appearance of probability, even if the view that the letter is genuine labored under the most serious difficulties.

Nevertheless I cannot admit that the question has been solved by the more recent criticism. Measured by the standard which this criticism is accustomed to employ, the epistle to the Philippians must be rejected as spurious. By admitting that it is impossible to understand this letter on the assumption of its pseudonymous character, criticism has allowed itself to be led into making a concession which is absolutely contradictory to its other assumptions. Holsten is undoubtedly right in maintaining that according to the standard of the great doctrinal and controversial epistles the doctrinal views of Philippians contain much that is surprising. With what triumphant assurance criticism would, if it served its purpose, reject as spurious a letter alleged to be from Paul in which he declares himself "touching the righteousness which is in the law blameless" (3:6), on the ground that the real Paul everywhere proceeds on the view that there is no such thing as righteousness under the law. It really required no very artificial exegesis to extract from 3:9 the meaning that justification is involved in vital union with Christ—a view by which, however, Paul's doctrine of salvation is exactly reversed. A verse like 4:8 actually reminds one more of the moralizing tone of the pastoral epistles than of the ethics rooted in the facts of salvation which are characteristic of the older letters. One is indeed quite justified in asking with Holsten why the title of apostle is lacking in the address, and where the *ἐπίσκοποι καὶ διάκονοι*, of whom not a trace is to be found else-

where in the Pauline letters, suddenly come from. And it is by no means easy to explain how the same Paul that in 1:23 is only in doubt whether he shall choose to die immediately in order to be with Christ, or to abide in the flesh for the sake of the church, in 3:11 is apparently not even yet sure of his resurrection from the dead. And there is no doubt that the admonition of the two women *coram publico* (4:2) is altogether unparalleled in the Pauline letters. Of course all these difficulties can be obviated, but not so long as one retains the finicalness which characterizes all our modern criticism.

But it remains true that the whole type of doctrine of our letter resembles that of the letters of the imprisonment much more closely than it does that of the great doctrinal and controversial letters, although when account is taken of the relatively small amount of doctrinal material in Philippians the difference is not so marked. There is not lacking a certain strong emphasis on the gnosis (1:9; 3:8, 10). It cannot be denied that the Christology goes beyond that of the older letters, or that emphasis upon the connection between the doctrine of salvation and practical life takes the place of the strong insistence on doctrine which characterizes the older letters. In passages like 2:10 and 3:20 there is a clear enough reference to the cosmic significance of the saving work of Christ. The emphatic admonition to unity in which the exhortation 2:2f. really culminates reminds us strongly of a characteristic feature of the letters of the imprisonment; and what 3:12-16 says about the true Christian perfection reminds us again of what the Colossian letter intimates about the false ways by which the theosophists of Colossæ professed to lead men to perfection. Holsten's lists of words, by which he undertakes to distinguish what is Pauline, un-Pauline, and anti-Pauline, need not be taken seriously; but if, after the prevailing fashion of modern criticism, one stumble over every new expression and note the absence of every catchword of the old Pauline letters, it is as easy to prove the spuriousness of Philippians as of Ephesians. The history of the criticism of the letter to the Philippians issues of necessity in a dilemma; either it must be recognized that the whole previous

method of criticism has been in certain respects very faulty and must undergo a thorough reform, or we must go back and question again the genuineness of Philippians. We have not yet reached our goal, not even with respect to the letter to the Philippians.

The chief reason for this state of affairs is that criticism as a whole has accomplished but little for the interpretation of the epistle to the Philippians, and that the historical situation which the letter presupposes is very far from being cleared up. Or, is it possible that some agreement has actually been reached, at least respecting the condition of the church which the letter presupposes? It will be useful to recall the course which the investigation of this matter has taken. In the case of the epistle to the Philippians it was the older criticism that held that the church was troubled by reason of the Judaistic errorists that were supposed to be referred to in chap. 3. A dark picture was painted of the parties into which the church was divided, and Rheinwald, in 1827, represented it as threatened with extinction by the division between Jewish and Gentile Christians. Then came a reaction, which, however, did not lead to the discovery of the seat of the error until Schinz in 1833 proved that the church was a purely Gentile-Christian body, in which there were no such parties, and that the praise which the apostle gave the church was wholly irreconcilable with the supposition of their existence. But even he put in the place of conflict over doctrine which was said to have divided the church only on the one side a boastful celebrating of their own superiority, called forth by personal disagreements, and on the other a jealous belittling of the merits of others. Almost all modern interpreters have followed him. But does this view accord any better with the praise repeatedly bestowed on *all* of the members of the church *individually* (cf. 1:3, 7, 8; 4:1)? And what basis is there for this view?

It is simply the intolerable fashion the interpreters have of assuming, the moment the apostle utters a word against a prevalent sin which is inherent in us all, that his readers must be guilty of it in a very exceptional degree. Accordingly evidence for this must be extorted from 2:2 ff. But would Paul really

have felt called upon to reprove before the whole church the quarrelsomeness of two women, which was probably due in the two cases to similar causes, if the church was itself guilty of exactly the same fault? Certainly not. Accordingly both on the side of the defenders and on that of the deniers of the genuineness of the letter there is more or less tendency to return to the old view. And so again we have the theory of two parties with a "divided Christian consciousness," or Judaizing heretical teachers. But I cannot discover that the new arguments in defense of this view are any better, or that the old arguments against it have been refuted. Of course the church which the apostle designates as his joy and his crown is composed of human beings. But I cannot allow myself to distort the picture which the apostle gives of it by introducing any kind of factious disorder. The epistle is not a letter of reproof. When he closes the expression of his joyfulness in imprisonment, of which no possible exigency can rob him, with the statement that it is in their power, by standing fast in one spirit, striving for the faith of the gospel, as well as by a harmony based on self-denying humility, not only to promote their own spiritual welfare, but also to increase and share his joy (1:27—2:18), this very form of expressing his admonition shows conclusively that he is not endeavoring to heal a serious rupture of the church.

But even in respect to the situation in Rome to which reference is made in 1:14-18, there is anything but clearness and agreement of opinion among scholars. The common opinion is that here also there is a reference to Judaizing heretics, and it was especially natural for those to adopt this opinion who regarded the Roman church as essentially or in large part a Jewish-Christian body. But in that case the way in which Paul minimizes the doctrinal differences between these people and himself, and rejoices if only Christ is made known, whatever the method, involves so glaring a contradiction with Gal. 1:8 f. that it would be impossible to ascribe the letter to Paul. Of what avail is the paltry subterfuge that Paul was softened by age, or that the church in question was not one of his own founding? On this point Paul could never change, could never regard

that other gospel as of equal value with his own. The latest opponent of the epistle (Holsten) and its latest defender (Paul Schmidt) both frankly admit this, though, to be sure, critics like Holtzmann and Jülicher still find no difficulty whatever in the old opinion. Nevertheless exegetically the latter is simply impossible, since the antithesis between the Judaizing and the Pauline preaching cannot be expressed by *εἴτε προφάσει εἴτε ἀληθείᾳ*. And where has Paul ever accused his Judaizing opponents simply of preaching Christ from envy of him (*διὰ φθόνον*, vs. 15)? He could never have done so. These opponents must have been personal rivals of the apostle, and in that case there is no ground for holding that they were Jewish Christians. As long ago as 1859 I advanced the opinion in my commentary that they were old teachers of the church who, finding themselves forced into the background by the unexpectedly prolonged stay of the apostle in Rome, where, despite his imprisonment, he became the central figure of the church, sought by redoubled zeal to outstrip him, and by criticism of himself and of his work to destroy his popularity. I admit that I cannot *prove* this to be the case, and I am entirely ready to accept any suggestion that is more in accord with the words; but I cannot go back to the old impossible views.

The hypotheses which have gathered around the passage 3 : 1 furnish a sad illustration of how matters stand in the exegesis of Philippians. Most interpreters have found here an allusion to earlier letters to the Philippians, as even the hypothesis-spinning criticism of the old rationalists found here the beginning of a new letter. But the most recent criticism of the Hausraths, Völkers, and Clemens, revels in ever new inventions of letters of which our letter is an unskillful patchwork. And what is the reason of all this? Simply that they will not see that the whole previous part of the letter has been treating of that Christian joy of which Paul is, *ex professo*, now about to speak again. Even the prelate Bengel long ago recognized that the epistle to the Philippians might properly be described as *epistola de gaudio*. Such a letter may not seem to modern criticism worthy of the apostle. But it gives no evidence of having any other purpose.

The flourishing Macedonian churches were just those that were most affected by the hostility of their unbelieving countrymen. To this was added the news of the imprisonment of their apostle, which had lasted now for years, and of the complete cessation of his missionary work. These things lay like a heavy burden upon his beloved church; and for this reason he could not better repay the gift they had sent him than to kindle in them, despite all the burden of the present, that profound joy in believing which filled him, though in chains and bonds. In chap. 1 he had said that they should promote and share this his joy; and all that he says in chap. 2 concerning the sending of Timothy and the return of Epaphroditus has to do with the fact that he desires to do what he can to promote their joy. Is it to be wondered at that in 3:1 he accompanies his *χαίρετε ἐν κυρίῳ* with an apology for always writing the same thing?

But that throughout the third chapter also he is speaking of the ground, means, and goal of true Christian joy is not so readily conceded. Here it has been customary to find a warning against Jewish-Christian heretics, either in Rome or in Philippi; the same Paul who in 1:18 was so mild in his attitude toward them speaking here in a tone that outdoes all the polemic against them that we have seen in Galatians and Corinthians. But this interpretation would require him to use *βλέπετε ἀπό* and not *βλέπετε* with the accusative, as 1 Cor. 1:26; 10:18 show. The verb, three times repeated for rhetorical emphasis, shows, moreover, that there are three separate categories of men to whom he directs their attention, in order, by means of the contrast which these present, to develop the ground on which the true Christian joy rests (3:3-11), the means by which it is to be continually promoted (3:12-16), and what its final goal is (3:17-21). That the unbelieving Jews constitute the third of the categories ought never to have been overlooked. Where has Paul designated the Jewish Christians as the *περιτομή* simply? Least of all could he do so here, where by the substitution of the word *κατατομή* (cf. Gal. 5:12) he intimates that because of their unbelief, by which they have lost all the privileges of the *περιτομή*, it has become a useless mutilation. Recent critics also,

like Hökstra, Holsten, Lipsius, and Paul Schmidt, opponents and defenders of the genuineness of the letter alike, recognize this. The privileges of which unbelieving Judaism boasts, in which it puts its trust, and the joy with which the apostle at his conversion gave up these things for the sake of Christ who is his only joy, is the theme of the following paragraphs.

But furthermore the *κακοὶ ἐργάται* are far from being the *ἐργάται δόλιοι* of 2 Cor. 11:13. They are those teachers in Rome whom Paul describes in 1:15-17, who take pleasure in envy and strife and in making trouble for him, as they think, in his bonds. And what can the *οὐχ ὅτι* of 3:12 signify except that he refers to the charge of these people that he imagined himself to be already perfect? For certainly nothing that he has previously said in the passage itself furnishes the slightest opportunity for the misunderstanding which he wishes here to avoid. On the contrary it is they who by their assumption of superiority to him and their rivalry with him make such a claim. True Christian joy can be attained only when the Christian is continually pressing forward toward the goal in order ever more perfectly to apprehend Christ, when he knows no other perfection than to be always striving after greater perfection. The ultimate purpose of his whole letter is that the church should by continually pressing forward toward this goal learn to overcome the spirit of despondency which oppresses it, and its anxiety for the future in the midst of all the threatenings of the present.

But exegesis has done its worst in the passage 3:17-21. The people there described have actually been held to be Jewish-Christian heretics. To be sure the opinion commonly held by interpreters down to the present day, that they were nominal Christians living immoral lives, is not much better. Can such a thing be possible in the beloved and highly praised Philippian church, for every member of which the apostle can make his supplication with joy (1:3)? If in Christendom today there are such nominal Christians—God forbid that it should be so!—who, though they have been baptized, have never learned what it means to be a Christian, it by no means follows that then,

when to be known as a Christian brought only disgrace and persecution, there were among the Christians enemies of the cross of Christ, who, with shameful indulgence, practiced idolatry. On the contrary, it can only be heathen whom in vs. 2 he designates as *κύνες* (*cf.* Rev. 22:15) in order thus to characterize their impure, indecent way of life—persons respecting whom he had once cherished the hope that they could be won for the gospel, but whom now he is compelled with deep sorrow to describe as given over to perdition. In contrast with them he shows how the man who finds his joy in Christ alone and has his citizenship with him to whom he belongs, in heaven, looks for him as his deliverer from the perdition to which these others have fallen, and having reached the goal actually attains that which the heathen vainly seek in their wrong way—as well as the glorification of the bodily life which they think to accomplish by their deification of the *κοιλία*, and the honor which they seek in their shame.

Since 1859 I have maintained this interpretation. But exegesis still goes on contentedly in its old impossible path. No wonder that the criticism of Philippians, despite all the defense of it even by recent critics, is unable to reach final conclusions. A book must first be understood before a final judgment concerning its author can be pronounced. I believe that I have shown that the epistle to the Philippians is still very far from being understood.

#### IX. THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.

The pastoral epistles have been to apologetics a perennial source of difficulty. Criticism in all its various schools has maintained that their spuriousness was definitively settled. But if, as we have learned since Baur's time, the task of criticism is to be recognized as the unfolding of the historical understanding of a document and of its origin, then in this instance its task is still very far from having been accomplished. One of the most significant points which apologetics has constantly urged against the view that here is a case of purely fictitious documents passing for Paul's was the abundance of purely personal and historical ref-

erences appearing, especially in the letter to Titus and in Second Timothy, for the fabrication of which no intelligible reason can be seen. Moreover we cannot quite stop with these two letters. It is true that in respect to the two men who in 1 Tim. 1:20 are delivered over to Satan, Jülicher as a compromise allows that perhaps the writer has in mind as a model an event of an earlier period. It is, however, noteworthy that both names recur in 2 Tim. 3:17; 4:14. And, to say the least, the advice which is given to the disciple of the apostle respecting his health in 1 Tim. 5:23, in a connection so obscure that a pseudonymous author would surely have no occasion to bring it in just there, appears so very strange as to be exceedingly difficult of comprehension as a mere fabrication. Criticism has always granted with regard to the other letters that they may be based on genuine Pauline elements. Second Timothy, especially, was regarded by Credner in his Introduction, dated 1836, as originating by combination and interpolation from two genuine letters of Paul, and Lemme in 1882 accepted the whole letter as genuine with the exception of a single somewhat extensive interpolation. Knoke and Hesse have recently (1887, 1889) attempted neatly to extract the Pauline elements from all three letters. Even such thoroughly positive theologians as Grau and Plitt proposed to defend the genuineness of the pastoral letters in this sense only, and also Kübel believed that the letters had received an odor of ecclesiasticism by a final redaction.

How the two most recent critics of the pastoral letters stand on this question is well worthy of consideration. Jülicher, quite in the manner of Credner, seeks to show how the author of Second Timothy had before him fragments of two different letters to Timothy which he put together unskillfully because he incorrectly regarded them as fragments of one and the same letter. In his reverence for Paul he could not but give them to the church; but as a couple of fragments were of little service to it, he filled them out by putting into the mouth of Paul what the Christian community of his day needed. In the same way he edited a fragment of a letter to Titus. Later with no such Pauline documentary basis he wrote First Timothy entire *currente calamo*,

freely gathering together his fundamental ideas which did not yet seem to him to be clearly and convincingly set forth in the two other letters. The critics themselves would have been primarily responsible for what seems to be an interpolation with a purpose by a skillful forger, since they would have sought to determine that which was genuine even down to single words and syllables, and to prove with the acuteness of a modern critic his method of using his material. Harnack says frankly that the pastoral letters are based on Pauline letters, or, more exactly, on fragments of such letters; sections of Second Timothy of considerable extent and importance, and a scant third of the letter to Titus, can be claimed as genuine, even if perhaps few verses apart from the historical references are reproduced without change; in First Timothy, on the other hand, while Pauline material is found, no single verse bears a clear indication of Pauline origin.

On this basis, indeed, the spuriousness of the pastoral epistles in the earlier sense is given up; their case, however, is but little strengthened, since even upon Harnack's form of the hypothesis it may be urged, as Jülicher rightly says of his own, that every attempt to separate the Pauline groundwork from the later redaction is utterly hopeless and leads only to an idle play of individual acuteness. In that case, however, it is obvious to remark that no clear idea of those fragments can properly be obtained, and so it becomes utterly impossible to decide the question how far it was still in accord with the spirit of the times to make such use of them or, more exactly, thus to work them over, and whether in that case the charge of conscious forgery can be met. Harnack occasionally intimates that in that time epistolary material would have been protected against interpolation; but if so it must be held that those Pauline fragments were not written in real epistolary form. In confirmation of this Jülicher also, although finding in the salutations the clearest traces of Pauline diction, regards it as incomprehensible that the apostle should designate himself in writing to intimate friends as he does in these salutations. It seems, however, very questionable whether, on this

supposition that the author used those epistolary fragments, this is a case of that kind of pseudonymous authorship which we describe as altogether innocent. That the author did not wish valuable material such as words of admonition and didactic exposition to be lost one can easily understand, but most of these historical or personal notes, greetings, and commissions, which were said to account for the existence of such epistolary fragments, cannot be said to belong to material of this class. If, nevertheless, the author of his own preference introduced these glosses or notes, although not in the least connected with the purpose of his composition, he could not have had the intention to accredit them as Pauline, and no one would hold that this method is in harmony with the character of naïve literary composition. My feeling is that this is the course which would be pursued by a later writer who, as Jülicher says, was inventing a situation in accordance with which he ascribes to the apostle the sending of instructions to renowned leaders of the churches. To this must be added that with every expansion of the genuine material underlying these epistles the question recurs anew whether the style and diction of the letters can really be so utterly un-Pauline as criticism affirms. But we have abundantly proven above that precisely at this point the method of the critical school is in urgent need of revision, so that it is impossible to solve this problem by details; furthermore if we abandon the attempt to separate the genuine Pauline basis from the later additions the problem is absolutely insoluble.

We are thus forced, notwithstanding the new turn which the investigation into the genuineness of these epistles seems to have taken in recent criticism, again to propound the question whether these letters in the recension in which we possess them absolutely preclude the view that they are in reality what they claim to be. Apologetics has always affirmed this to be the case. Still it has deprived its efforts of all success, because a large number of its spokesmen have persisted in relating the letters to the life of the apostle as known to us. We must, however, concede, and that for the reason often mentioned, that this is utterly impossi-

ble. All artificial combinations do not suffice to lend to this assumption even a shadow of plausibility. If these letters are to be considered as genuine, they must have been composed at a later period of the apostle's life which is unknown to us. It is true that only recently Jülicher has again argued very strenuously that in view of the fullness of our traditions the whole notion of a later period unknown to us is improbable, being in fact simply a precarious postulate of those who, at whatever cost, wish to maintain something that is absolutely untenable. It is to be said on the other side, however, that Harnack, though maintaining that these letters in their present form are utterly un-Pauline, holds on quite independent grounds, without such ulterior motives, that Paul was set free from the recorded Roman imprisonment and accordingly lived at least five years longer. To these years (A. D. 59-64) Harnack assigns the composition of the genuine letters underlying our present recension, or, as he really should say according to his own exposition, the fragments of letters. Since even Harnack does not seem to me to prove that the apostle's death took place during the so-called Neronian persecution of the Christians, these five years ought, I think, to be extended to nine, and since no one can deny that such a term of years gives ample space for the composition of the letters, this at once breaks the force of all objections to their authenticity.

Jülicher thinks that even if this be granted the situation, at least of First Timothy and Titus, is incomprehensible; but this cannot be conceded. He overlooks altogether that the apostle who originally intended to return shortly was, as is clearly intimated in 1 Tim. 3:15, delayed, and that this delay sufficiently accounts for the renewed emphasis and expansion of the commissions given to Timothy. The intended recall of Titus (Titus 3:12) does not preclude the hypothesis of a delay, since the apostle had been taught by ample experience how little he could with certainty count on the execution of plans that looked so far ahead as spending the winter at Nicopolis, and since we cannot say, with any degree of definiteness, how long it might have been before he could have sent Artemas or Tychicus to relieve

Titus. The passage in Titus 3: 13 clearly shows that it was the journey of Zenas and Apollos that induced him to accompany their letters of introduction with this letter. Strong statements such as that he describes to Titus in detail the Cretan heretical teachers, with whom Titus certainly must have been better acquainted than he was, prove nothing; for a reasonably unprejudiced exegesis will show that Paul simply justifies his instructions by reference to the character of these heretics. Jülicher's arguments concerning the manner in which the Pauline pretender talks about himself and his intimate friends carry no greater weight. Whether here and there an occasion appears for the apostle to refer to his own apostolic calling or his past history can be decided only by detailed exegesis. Paul certainly does not become a scoundrel ("*ein Schandmensch*") simply because according to 1 Tim. 1: 15 he feels himself, on account of his persecutions of the church, "a chief of sinners." He may even then have served God with a clear conscience (2 Tim. 1: 3), though he was still in error. That Timothy, though he was many years older than when he became an assistant of the apostle, was still in need of encouragement in order to be able to represent the authority of the apostle over against the undoubtedly aged presbyters (1 Tim. 4: 12) no one can reasonably doubt. Jülicher explains the admonition to Timothy (2 Tim. 2: 22) as meaning that Timothy should be careful to conduct himself properly. But this view is rendered untenable by the whole context, which shows the admonition to be directed against the youthful eagerness to convert those in error by passionate appeals and arguments, a zeal which, as is well known, does not cease with a certain year of one's life.

It is not my purpose to add another to the many discussions of these subjects. I have intended only to show by the example of the latest Introduction to the New Testament how criticism stands in relation to them. It only repeats the old arguments in more emphatic words; and either does not trouble itself about the counter-arguments which are urged against it or scornfully sets them aside. It is for this reason that so little progress is really made on so many points, even on those where

agreement would be altogether within the range of possibility. If the pastoral epistles are actually to be regarded as pseudonymous productions, it will still be necessary to admit that the author had a measurably clear conception of the rôle which he meant to assume. It can least of all serve the purpose of criticism to combine with the distinguishing characteristic of pseudonymity that of absence of thought. Yet it is never weary of conjecturing that its pseudonymous author contrived impossible and absurd situations, that he conceived of the relation of Paul to his friends in an entirely contradictory fashion, that he mixed up the present and the future, and made similar blunders which we have still to consider. And yet the whole plan of proposing to address the church of his time in the name of the apostle itself testifies to a certain boldness of conception which must have been accompanied by at least the simplest literary qualifications. Of course that does not in itself prove genuineness. If the situation is conceivable, if the apostle may have spoken as the letters speak, then naturally the author may have carried his plan through successfully just as the real apostle may have written them. Only the critics ought not to spoil our pleasure in our New Testament writings by this petty, pedantic criticism of them which only testifies to a want of inclination to think their way somewhat more deeply into them. The decision of the question of genuineness must be sought in an entirely different direction.

The first question concerns the doctrinal errors which are combated in our letters. I grant that in connecting them with "the beginnings of gnosticism" very little has been accomplished. But neither has criticism as yet been able to explain these errors. A long quest was made for a definite gnostic system that fitted the situation; as none could be found it has been claimed that, though the author wished to combat the whole movement, he did so only by allusion, since he had also to keep up the rôle of Paul. Whereupon the critics proceed to extract from the most harmless passages, for which actual parallels can be shown everywhere in the epistles of Paul, a polemic against particular gnostic heretical teachers. But such polemic can be

found in such passages only *if* it has first been proved that the pastoral letters have these heretics in mind. But that is just what cannot be done. Harnack calls the characterization of the heretical teachers "confused." But that is just where I hold him to be in error. On the contrary, the presumption with which one should first of all approach the letters is that the author knows what he proposes to combat, and that even if he takes the rôle of Paul and must therefore deal only in generalities, he must be fully confident of striking the evil at its heart. In fact, however, his characterization of the then existing errors of doctrine is always the same, even to his favorite expressions; the position which he takes toward them is always the same; one should be drawn into no discussion with them, one should simply turn them off, one should set over against this unsound doctrine the only sound system, which holds fast to the old gospel, the truth of which the author therefore repeatedly affirms. I do not know that at any place or time in the history of the ancient church gnosticism was combated in this fashion.

If, indeed, the author of 1 Tim. 4:1-4, for reasons which are clear enough in this connection, speaks of an error of doctrine which he fears is coming in the future, but no trace of which is to be seen in what he says elsewhere of the false doctrines of the present (*i. e.*, the period in which he is assumed to have written), and if nevertheless one finds in it a characteristic sign of this present, then of course everything is in confusion. If the author finds the sanctimoniousness under the cloak of which the unhealthy zeal for teaching is concealed (2 Tim. 3:1-7) so dangerous on this account, because the immorality to be expected in the last days will eagerly seize upon a doctrine which keeps the religious interest active without requiring true inner renewal, there is still in this position no untenable mixture of present and future to be found. If the author of 2 Tim. 2:16-18 points to the fact that to argue with these persons incites them to more and more impious assertions, and illustrates this fact by a single example, and if a characterization of the false 'doctrines combated in the letters is then found in that example it is impossible to gain a correct picture of it. If the

author of Titus 1: 15 f. is giving a characterization of the unbelieving Jews, to whose myths and commandments of men some are turning back (vs. 14), and if in that teaching the false doctrines of the post-apostolic time are regarded as characterized, then it is not surprising if the picture turns out confused. It seems at present to be granted that the *ψευδώνυμος γνώσις* (1 Tim. 6: 20) is not a catchword adopted by our author from Hege-sippus, but one which Eusebius repeated after him. But when Jülicher and Harnack cannot yet tear themselves away from the idea that the *ἀντιθέσεις* refer to the famous work of Marcion they forget that this interpretation is rendered exegetically impossible by the fact that this expression is joined with *βεβήλους* *under one article*. After all has been said it is impossible to claim that criticism has succeeded in really explaining the polemic of our letters from the point of view of contemporaneous history.

The same is true respecting the internal condition of the churches which is presupposed in our letters, or which it is their purpose to bring about. Despite the splendid service which Harnack has done in clearing up the history of the development of the government of the church, I have looked in vain for any new light from him on this question. The very first redaction of the pastoral epistles, which is still quite distinct from additions of a much later date, is regarded as revealing the presence of an ecclesiastical rank with special rights and duties. It is absolutely impossible for me to discover anything of the sort in our letters. When the church assures support to the presbyters who also give themselves diligently to teaching (1 Tim. 5: 17 f.) exactly as in 1 Cor., chap. 9, and, for the same reasons that are given in that passage, I can find in that only the endeavor, pervading all three letters, by the closest possible union of the teaching and ruling functions in the church, to promote the maintenance of sound doctrine made so necessary by the evident neglect of the charismatic gift and the spread of false doctrine. I can find nothing of the other "rights" which are assigned to them. Jülicher, again, speaks of the division of the church into clergy and laity, accomplished in fact, even if not in name, which he founds upon a reference to the passage discussed

above. It makes strongly against this view that everywhere only moral integrity and uprightness in family life is demanded of the officers in the church, and that nowhere is a higher dignity or special grace for their office spoken of. According to Harnack the letters assign to the disciples of the apostle a position for which no analogy can be found in the first century. But the chief duty which is continually laid upon them is simply that of instruction and admonition. They are to have charge of the organization of the church and to guard against mistakes in the selection of officers of the congregation. The qualifications necessary for such officers are to be determined only by the church itself. All other regulations for the church services (1 Tim., chap. 2) or the enrollment of the widows of the church (1 Tim., chap. 5) belong to the church as such.

The one thing that goes beyond that is the discipline of the presbyters, which, according to 1 Tim. 5:19 f., is assigned to Timothy in the more mature conditions of the Ephesian church. Well, to whom ought it to have been assigned, as long as no monarchical episcopate yet existed? And of this not the least trace appears in our letters. Even here no special method of procedure is prescribed, but on the well-known Old Testament rule it is affirmed that no process may be instituted against the presbyters without two or three witnesses to establish the accusation, since such a process, even if it should end with their acquittal, would steadily undermine their position in the church. But the *λοιποί* of vs. 20 are, as the context would lead us to expect, not the laity in contrast with the clergy, but the other presbyters. The so-called ordination of Timothy, in connection with which there is repeated reference to the prophetic words that designated him to be the helper of the apostles, cannot be intended to introduce an ecclesiastical institution, especially as in the case of Titus there is no reference to anything of the kind. The *χάρισμα* of which mention is made in connection with it (1 Tim. 4:14) is, according to 2 Tim. 1:6, the *charisma* of teaching, not a special grace that goes with the office. Moreover, unless the Book of Acts is to be regarded as entirely valueless, the laying on of hands is an ancient apostolic custom.

It is certain that there are to be seen in the Ephesian church — but only there — evidences of advanced development in church life, tendencies to confessional formulæ, fragments of an ancient church psalmody, traces of fixed liturgical formulæ. What do we know about the period when these began to take shape in the church?

This leads us to discuss the age in which, according to the view of criticism, our letters must have been written. Jülicher places them *ca.* 125; Harnack, *ca.* 90–110; the difference is not very significant, as Harnack also accepts still later interpolations which take us down beyond the age of Marcion. But Harnack has established the fact that Polycarp already knew and used these like other Pauline letters. The question whether the Ignatian letters, which are essentially contemporaneous with Polycarp, knew them is unessential, though I believe that it must be answered in the affirmative. The Barnabas letter, which in Harnack's view is essentially later, does not enter into the question, although I think that its knowledge of our letters can be proved. Of the so-called first letter of Clement, Harnack himself does not venture to maintain with Ewald that in the "undeniable genealogical relationship" the priority belongs to it. How one can maintain, after all has been said, that the attestation of the pastoral epistles is less satisfactory than that of the other letters of Paul, I cannot understand. That Marcion did not have them in his canon is very far from proving that he did not know them. In the first place, they were letters to individuals, and could not lay claim to universal acceptance in the church. The case is somewhat different with the letter to Philemon, in so far as it was inseparably joined to the Colossian letter, and yet Marcion has separated it from that letter and placed it at the end of his list. When we observe in what an artificial way even as late as the third century justification was constantly found for having taken into the canon of the church at large letters directed to individual churches, we understand how the Muratorian canon is compelled expressly to declare that these letters, though directed only to individuals, had been promoted to the position of normative doctrinal writings of the church and holy books. When

now Marcion made the first attempt to limit the number of writings which were to be regarded as normative in the church, it was only natural, since he was restrained by no ecclesiastical tradition, that he should exclude these private letters, which were inconvenient for him since their polemic had been at an early period brought to bear upon him and other gnostics. But this implies no doubt of their coming from the apostle from whom they purported to come and whose other letters he also corrected to suit his purpose. The decision respecting their genuineness therefore must be based on internal evidence.

Moreover I believe that I have shown how far short criticism has come of being able, on the basis of the false doctrines combated in them, and of the condition of the church which they presuppose, to determine with certainty a time in which they must have originated.

I have not proposed to offer anything new in the foregoing discussion. I have only set forth the views which are expressed in my *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, just appearing in a third edition (Berlin, 1897), and which have long approved themselves to me as correct. I have not hesitated where it seems to me that I have in that work written clearly and strongly to repeat now and then the very words. However I trust that in this survey many things have been put in a clearer light, and that stimulus has been given to a renewed consideration of my view by its more thorough defense in many important points. What I have said is based on a constantly renewed, thorough, and detailed exegesis of the Pauline epistles, in which it is my judgment that the criticism of the present day is altogether too deficient. They who wish to acquaint themselves with this exegetical work as a whole may now find it gathered together in my *Paulinische Briefe*. It may be that this renewed consideration of it will remove many prejudices and cause many critical results claimed as final to appear exceedingly doubtful.